

THE  
**CHRISTIAN DISCIPLE.**

NEW SERIES—No. 23.

---

*September and October, 1822.*

---

ON THE ATTEMPT TO DEPRIVE UNITARIANS OF THE NAME OF  
CHRISTIANS.

FROM THE UNITARIAN DEFENDANT.

AMONG the variety of injuries which have been heaped upon those, the basis of whose religious creed is the One True God, and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent, not the least in magnitude or importance consists in the attempt to rob them of the name of *Christians*. We feel, however, very sure, that the number of such as have resorted to this ultimate and puerile measure of controversy, is as yet comparatively few. It was at first, we believe, set on foot by writers who had lost their temper in debate, and is now principally confined to those exclusive and intolerant religionists, who, being willing to go all lengths in their creeds, are equally ready to go all lengths in their denunciations. But, unless we are very greatly deceived, a vast majority of those who are allowed to be orthodox Christians, have not as yet given into the cruel and preposterous injustice which it is our present object to expose. Next to refusing us the name of Christians, the most severe term applied to us, with the exception of *infidel*, which is the same as denying us to be Christians, is that of *heretics*. But even the common signification of *this* term does not necessarily exclude the title of Christian. Johnson defines a heretic to be "one, who propagates his private opinions in opposition to the catholic (or universal) church." Neither the Romish nor the English church has gone so far as to confound heretics in all cases with infidels. No ecclesiastical historian that we know of has intimated the identity of heretics with infidels, or insinuated that he was not giving an account of Christians, when treating of heretics. We just mention these facts in passing, to show the

extremely loose and inconsistent practice of some violent partizans, who, thinking their cause is the best served by the greatest number of opprobrious names thrown out on their opponents, make no scruple to deny us to be Christians and to call us Heretics in one and the same breath! Happily, these two contradictory charges annihilate each other. If we are really heretics, in the modern sense of the word, we are only mistaken and obstinate Christians; if we are no Christians at all, then we certainly are set free from the burden of being heretics. In this dilemma, our revilers may take their choice. But enough of this.

We were going to remark, that the title of *heretics*, though a good deal softer than the absolute denial of any right to the Christian name, is still by no means universally applied to Unitarians. Many, many, orthodox, pious, moderate, sensible, yet firm and zealous Christians, conscious that neither Johnson's definition, nor the usual ecclesiastical acceptance of the word *heretic* is the truly scriptural one, think no more of giving that title to Unitarians, than they do that of murderers and assassins. Very poorly is he versed in the criticism of the New Testament, who does not know that neither the word *heretic* nor *heresy* is ever used in that sacred book with the least reference to true or false *doctrines*, or to the honest and peaceable *opinions* entertained by any individuals, but that those words solely and entirely refer to *factions and quarrelsome practices*, which began to spring up in the very earliest periods of Christianity. Whoever has read Part 4, Dissertation 9, of the Preliminary Dissertations to the New Testament, written by the very pious, learned and orthodox Dr. Campbell, never can give to modern Unitarians the name of heretics, unless he intends to abandon the meaning of scriptural phraseology, and to take up with the language of exasperated popes and councils, who in the pride of fancied infallibility, regard a mere difference of opinion, however conscientious, in as black a light as they do a spirit of faction and division. Indeed, when it is recollected, that the followers of papacy consider us all, to a man, and without any exception, as *heretics*, one would suppose that the absurdity of this modern and unscriptural use of the word must often come home to those Protestants who are so liberal in applying it to their brethren. It is for the foregoing reasons, that the most moderate and rational among the believers in the Trinity, as was above observed, have not only refused to deny us the name of Christians, but will not go even so far as to fix upon us the miserable and childish nickname of heretics. We have the best reasons for stating that a very large majority of Protestant believers regard Unitarians in



no darker light, and denominate them by no harsher epithet, than that of misguided Christians, whose sincerity, integrity, and right to courteous language, are just as much to be respected, as their possible errors are to be pitied and avoided. Yet, although we believe this to be by far, very far, the *largest* class of those who differ from us, it is by no means the most active, jealous or hostile class. There are some who seem determined to keep up the ball. By loud and pertinacious reiterations, their object appears to be, to force upon the public ear, the assertion that we ought not to be called Christians, and to make the din of controversy take place of solid and clear conviction on the subject.—And as the names of Quaker and Methodist, though first applied in derision, have come at length to be serious and universal appellations, so a quiet world may be made to settle down in time, by the mere force of overbearing acclamation, into the bitter injustice of which we are now complaining. To resist the tendency to this state of things, it becomes our duty to raise a voice, however feeble, and in some measure at least to counteract by fair arguments, by clear statements, and by direct expostulations, this clamour of epithets, and virulence of denunciation. For this purpose, we engage, at the stake of our reputation, to demonstrate to the satisfaction of every thinking and candid man, that the denial of the name of Christian to Unitarians, is in the first place manifestly *unscriptural*, in the second place, decidedly *unjust*, and in the third place, especially in the present state of the Christian world, highly *imprudent* and *inexpedient*.

First, it is *unscriptural*. Very happily for our purpose in this particular point of the controversy, we have a verse in the Bible, in which the word Christian occurs, and that too almost as if this controversy had been prophetically anticipated, mentioning the very circumstance of the name being first applied to a particular class of men. We allude to the 26th verse of the 11th chapter of the Book of Acts, of which these are the concluding words: *And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.* Now the point at issue will be, who were really the *disciples*? And to ascertain this, can we consult any record more authentic than this very book of Acts, where the name in question is defined? Will our opponents allow the three thousand souls, who were converted by the preaching of Peter soon after the ascension of our Saviour, to be disciples and to be Christians? They must of course. Will they insist that these three thousand souls became Christians in consequence of any other doctrines, or opinions, or principles, or statements, than those which occurred in the sermon or address of Peter to them, just preceding their conver-

sion? We dare to say they will not. Turn then to the second chapter of Acts, in which the history of this whole transaction is recorded, and read the speech of Peter, and see if one allusion is made in it to the Trinity, or one allusion to the total depravity of human nature, or one allusion to the death of Christ as a satisfaction for the sins either of the world or of the elect, or one allusion to any of those dogmas which are tendered to us in modern times as the *sine qua non* of our being called Christians. On the contrary, this address of Peter is for nothing in the world so remarkable, as for the very broadest and most ultimate Unitarianism! After quoting a passage from the Prophet Joel, he thus proceeds to the business of his harangue. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, A MAN approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by him," &c.—In the next verse but one, still speaking of Jesus, he says, *whom God hath raised up*, and again, verse 32, *This Jesus hath God raised up*. And in verse 36, *God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ*. Filled with convictions arising from such statements as these, three thousand men in one day became undeniably Christians; and when the same convictions and statements are admitted at the present day by certainly as many as a million of persons scattered all over Christendom, though vast numbers do not go nearly as far in heterodoxy as Peter in the above speech,—there are to be found some Christians of wider creeds and a more metaphysical faith, who denounce the simplicity of belief which Peter and his converts bequeathed us, and would tear from our foreheads the name to which we attach all our dearest privileges and blessings here, and all our richest hopes of an hereafter.

Let our readers now turn to the next public speech of Peter, in the *third* chapter of Acts, particularly the 22d verse.\* Was Peter a Christian? Why then did not his mind labour and overflow with the topics and qualifications which we are told constitute the essence of Christianity and alone entitle men to the name of Christians?—It is said too, in Acts iv. 4. that the number of those converted by the just-mentioned speech, was about five thousand. Were *they* Christians too? Certainly. But what proof have we that they were converted by any other, than the purest Unitarian doctrines, principles and arguments? See the above speech again.

In ch. iv. vs. 32, 33,† a multitude of new converts appear to

\* For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you.

† And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart, and of one soul;



have been formed by the simple preaching of *the resurrection of Jesus*, a doctrine upon which Unitarians have been blamed as laying a disproportionate stress, but which they have the strongest reasons for representing as the great corner stone of Christianity. Our opponents we presume will allow the above-mentioned converts to be "Christians."

Listen to the following dialogue and transaction between the Apostle Philip and the treasurer of the Ethiopian queen, Acts viii. 37, 38. "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest [be baptised.] And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptised him." Would the Presbytery of Harmony receive this qualification for baptism? Would Dr. Miller exchange pastoral labors with the Apostle Philip? Was the eunuch after baptism a Christian or not? And what proof is there that he differed in belief from the sternest and simplest Unitarian of the present day?

The moment that Saul became miraculously converted, and converted into a *Christian* too, what did he preach? The articles of modern orthodoxy? No, "And straightway he preached Christ in the Synagogues, that he is *the Son of God*," Acts c. 9. v. 20. and "proving that this is the very Christ," or the anointed, v. 22; doctrines, to which Unitarians incessantly adhere, and which when they abandon, it will be time enough to deny them to be Christians. Nor is Saul here recorded to have preached any thing else.

And how did Cornelius and all his kinsmen and friends become *Christians*? In consequence of the following speech of Peter, which we here copy at length, as a specimen of the principles, doctrines, and favourite topics, which are generally urged by Unitarians.

"Then Peter opened his mouth and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons. But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. The word which *God* sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; (he is Lord of all :) That word, *I say*, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; How God anointed Jesus of Na-

neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common.

And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all,

zareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew, and hanged on a tree: Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly; Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."—Acts c. x. vs. 34—43.

We have thus transcribed all the material passages in the history of the Acts of the Apostles, up to the time, when the disciples are recorded first to have received the name of Christians at Antioch. If we have not demonstrated to the perfect satisfaction of every intelligent reader, our *first* proposition, viz. that the denial of the name Christian to Unitarians is *unscriptural*, we shall have but little heart to go on and prove that it is *unjust* in a variety of points of view, as well as very *imprudent* and *inexpedient*.

In respect to its *injustice*,—if we have succeeded in showing it to be unscriptural, it is of course, in that point of view, unjust. But we have a variety of other considerations in hand, which we trust will assist in convincing our opponents still more strongly of the injustice of which we complain.

We would, in the first place, call their attention to the different acceptations under which the word Christian is received in the world. Sometimes it is used for the sole purpose of large geographical distinctions, comprehending, without excepting individual cases of atheists, deists, and other unbelievers, all the inhabitants of a given division of the globe. Thus Europe is a region, in this sense usually denominated Christian, in contradistinction to Pagan and Mahometan countries. Now, though there is nothing religious or spiritual in this acceptation of the word, yet it is expressive of a vast number of privileges and blessings and excellencies which peculiarly belong to those portions of the world called Christian. The very mention of the name Christian suggests to the mind a degree of civilization, refinement, illumination, progress in moral and political science, skill in the arts, cultivation in literature, attainments in the exact sciences, and possession of many kinds of virtue, all of which are as much the inalienable birthright of Unitarians, as of the most determined champions of orthodoxy. And herein consists a part of the injus-



tice and fallacy which we are now dragging to light ; which is, that certain Trinitarians, in revolving for a time in their minds a few speculative doctrines, come at length to attach so exclusive an importance to those doctrines, as to make them the test by which a man shall be called Christian ; and Unitarians, finding it impossible in their hearts and souls to stand such a test, are consequently with a great deal of formality, solemnity, and earnestness denied all right to a participation in the Christian name. And what is the consequence ? Why, three quarters of those who are influenced by the argument, will not have the leisure or reflection to discriminate between the two significations of which the word Christian is susceptible. From the irresistible influence of association of ideas, they immediately class Unitarians in their imaginations with all that is odious or abominable in Mahometanism, Judaism, Paganism ; exclude them from all share in that moral splendour, that civil exaltation, that intellectual glory, which distinguish Christian nations amidst the inhabitants of the world ; regard them as incapable even of those virtues of nature, which from their softness, and excellence, and conformity to the spirit of the gospel, have appropriately received the appellation of Christian, and learn to look upon them, countrymen, friends, neighbours and acquaintances as they are, as something in the light of a distinct and meaner cast of people. Now it would lessen not the injustice of the thing, though our revilers should disclaim the intention of rushing to such lengths of abuse as are involved in the above-mentioned consequences. Because, when they deny us to be Christians, they make no limitation—no specification—no distinction—no modification. If they would only introduce some qualifying epithet, or phrase, into their assertion, such as, “ we can’t allow Unitarians to be orthodox Christians,” or “ Christians in a Calvinistic sense of the word,” and the like, we should not have so much cause to complain, but would let our orthodox and theological reputations go for what they were worth, if we could not defend them upon separate grounds. But as long as there is current in the world a wider and more comprehensive sense to the word Christian, we do cordially protest against this modern device of entrapping unreflecting people into a sudden and illegitimate abhorrence of a class of men, by wresting from them a name which in its general acceptation they have never, never forfeited, though they may not be entitled to the narrower and more sectarian application of it, which is drawn from the writings of Calvin.

We already anticipate a kind of an answer to the foregoing statement. It may be said, “ by denying you outright the name of Christians, we no more exclude you from the privileges and as-

sociations attached to its general and civil sense, than has been done in the case of professed sceptics, deists, infidels, and atheists, residing in Christian countries." To this we reply. Whenever the odium stirred up against deists and infidels residing in Christian countries, is sufficiently strong to place *them* in the light of outlaws from the civil, moral, and intellectual blessings that surround them, and to which they themselves perhaps contribute, we earnestly contend that in this case there is a manifest injustice inflicted even on deists and infidels. Therefore, it is a poor excuse to say to Unitarians, you have no right to complain of injustice, since the very same thing has been long perpetrated against sceptics and deists. This would rather aggravate than diminish our cause of complaint.

But though the foregoing argument is perfectly strong and legitimate, we will not insist on it any further. We do not need it, and that for a very good reason;—there is no sort of parallel between the two cases which our opponents would bring forward. For deists and atheists have themselves *voluntarily renounced* the name of Christian in its theological acceptation, which Unitarians never have done, and never will do. If the former are willing to encounter the various collateral disadvantages resulting from an abandonment of the Christian name, that diminishes not the injustice committed against us, until it can be shown, that we cherish the very same principles with deists and infidels, and assume the name of Christian, for the purpose of enjoying a reputation and credit to which we are not in reality entitled. And this involves us in two inquiries, the issue of which will not only confirm the subordinate point we have been endeavouring to establish, but will also settle the whole question before us.

First, then, do Unitarians indeed cherish the same principles with infidels and deists? To this question, we solemnly answer, no more than light is the same with darkness. But a solemn asseveration not being enough, we entreat of those, who are able and willing to let prejudice give way to the force of facts, to examine for one moment the following statements. The Deist regards the general story of the New Testament as the invention of impostors, or the vision of enthusiasts. The Unitarian receives it as the faithful record of honest eye-witnesses, and the sober concurrent declaration of several good men in their right senses. The Deist, being compelled by the weight of historical evidence to allow the existence of such a person as Jesus Christ, accounts for his alleged miracles, and all the supernatural attributes of his character and events of his life by natural causes,\* or by the de-

\* See Rousseau's *Letters écrites de la Montagne*, a book, which like the other writings of that splendid wretch, abounds with the most insidious sophistries mingled with some profound truths and accurate reasonings.



lusion or the dishonesty of his biographers. The Unitarian believes in the truth of the miracles and in the preternatural union of Jesus with the Deity, with as much confidence as in any fact in history. The Deist denies, the Unitarian acknowledges a revelation. But it is of no use further to multiply these points of contrast. The two or three already alleged are sufficient to demonstrate that the two classes of men in question are in their tenets perfect antipodes to each other, and that therefore when Unitarians are put off with the assurance that the same quarters are granted to them which are granted to infidels and deists, they ought to remonstrate against the wicked *injustice* as well as added *insult*, of the classification, and shew the falsity of the grounds on which it is made.

But further, not only is there a mountainous incompatibility between the principles of Deists and Unitarians; we throw ourselves on the candour of every considerate man, to decide also whether Unitarians possess not *positive* qualifications sufficient to entitle them to the Christian name. We will omit, as before, the evidence from Scripture, (though many, we hope, have already regarded that as decisive,) and will place the subject on more general grounds. That Unitarians do gather some kind of system of religion and morals from the instructions of Christ and the writings of his apostles, we presume not even our opponents will deny. That we profess or attempt to deduce our religion and morality from no other quarter, we hold to be equally manifest; the only real question between us and Trinitarians being, whether we interpret the Christian Scriptures aright. Whatever are our views of the person and nature of Christ, yet, that we acknowledge his spiritual authority, that we regard him as a heaven commissioned instructor, that we consider his commands supremely binding, that we recommend unceasingly the cultivation of his spirit, that we allow him to be "the *head* of all things to the church," that we look upon him as our *Master* in a religious point of view, all this is too notorious to require proof. But are not these positive relations in which we stand to Christ sufficient to entitle us to the appellation of Christians, according to the common use of derivative words? Unitarians place Christ at an incomparably higher exaltation than Mahometans place Mahomet. And yet no one pretends to say that Mahometans do not deserve their name on account of their not absolutely deifying their master. Even Miss Hannah Adams, before she became, what she has been for several years, a most decided Unitarian, and while she was a strict Calvinist, would not permit sectarian zeal to transport her so far as to thrust Unitarians out of the pale of Christianity in her celebrated Dictionary of Religion. Nor has any historian of re-

ligious sects that we know of acted differently. It really looks like the last argument, new or old, in the treasury of Trinitarians, and as if every thing else they could advance had been answered or exhausted, to come down in this manner to the spiteful play of calling and refusing names.

We trust we shall not be misunderstood in adducing one consideration more in proof of the particular *injustice* now under animadversion. Without arrogating to our own denomination a disproportionate share of piety, operative faith, and the Christian graces, we would venture humbly to ask, whether a considerable number of eminent individuals, who have embraced our mode of belief, and have confessedly been the ornaments of the Christian church, as well as of human nature, can with any fairness be denied an appellation to which they attached more value than to any other blessing on earth. Newton lived, and Watts died, a Unitarian. Shall a few zealots at this period dare to reverse the decision of the whole Christian world, which has so long reckoned those two men among the most favoured disciples of Jesus? Lardner devoted the whole of a humble and innocent life to exemplifying the spirit of the gospel in private, and publishing works in defence of its credibility, of which every Christian denomination is glad to avail itself to repel the attacks of deists and unbelievers; yet he was a Unitarian. The venerable Anna Letitia Barbauld, who is now in her 81st year,—whose beautiful hymns have been lisped for half a century by the child of nearly every pious parent who speaks the English tongue,—Mrs. Barbauld, trusting with ripened expectations and firm hope in the Redeemer to resign her spirit into the hands of him who gave it—happens to belong to the obnoxious fold of Unitarians; though even the publisher of a religious paper, which has countenanced in its review of Dr. Miller's Letters the denial of the name of Christians to Unitarians, has found something in the following most exquisite and touching verses worthy of being presented to his readers:

A THOUGHT ON DEATH.

BY MRS. BARBAULD.

*Written in her ninetieth year.\**

When life as opening buds is sweet,  
And golden hopes the spirit greet,  
And youth prepares his joys to meet,  
Alas! how hard it is to die!

When scarce is seiz'd some borrowed prize,  
And duties press, and tender ties

\* We think this statement of her age must be incorrect. Unless we are very much deceived, we would say it should be eightieth. Yet we have no exact knowledge of the fact.



Forbid the soul from earth to rise,  
How awful then it is to die!

When one by one those ties are torn,  
And friend from friend is snatch'd forlorn,  
And man is left alone to mourn,  
Ah! then how easy 'tis to die!

When trembling limbs refuse their weight,  
And films slow gathering dim the sight,  
And clouds obscure the mental light,  
'Tis nature's precious boon to die!

When faith is strong, and conscience clear,  
And words of peace the spirit cheer,  
And vision'd glories half appear,  
'Tis joy, 'tis triumph then to die!

The revered author of these lines not a Christian! Ah well, words and fashions vary in these modern days. In our own country, to say nothing of thousands besides, we suppose that the names of Mayhew, and Buckminster, and Forster, must be torn from the catalogue of Christians, and nailed up, on the black board of—this pen recoils in writing deists and infidels.

It still remains to show, as was originally designed, the *inexpediency* and *imprudence* of this proceeding on the part of some Trinitarians.

And first, we complain of it as unnecessarily widening the breaches which already exist among Christians. A spirit of conciliation and tenderness exerted by the orthodox would be infinitely more likely to attract Unitarians back to the path of truth, if they are indeed in an error, than this ulterior measure of defiance, exclusion and denunciation. It may lacerate the feelings of a few timorous and tender hearted persons, it may induce others to be silent in spite of their convictions, and it may for a very short time, and in a very small degree, obstruct the progress of the offending doctrines. Yet on the other hand, zealous, but well meaning Trinitarians can have no possible idea of the astonishing contrary effect produced among Unitarians by these violent and proscriptive measures. We can conceive of no greater injury that can be inflicted on a heart of the least sensibility than to rob it of the name of Christian. And will men sit down quietly and tamely under the reception of injury? It is not in human nature to do it. We venture to declare, that since the memorable Reformation conducted by Luther, there is no instance recorded in ecclesiastical annals of a progress so rapid and extensive in the dissemination of religious opinions as has taken place with respect to Unitarianism in America during the last ten years. And whom have we to thank for it? Why none on earth but those, who perceiving the mere existence, or at most the slow and silent march of free inquiry stealing gradually along, saw fit to rouse its latent energies by interposing mounds of misrepresentation, or calling

forth its mighty resistance by proscriptive denunciation. The reaction was inevitable, was irresistible. Unitarianism raised its sleeping head, shook from its brow the ineffectual arrows that were hurled from every quarter against it, and strode forth to unexpected, unsought for, and unexampled victory. God knows that these representations of the fact are not put forth in the spirit of boasting, but rather in that of humiliation. We are ashamed of human nature, that evil is so often necessary to the production of good. We lament that the glory and the triumph of our cause have been laid on a foundation so disparaging to the spirit of the age, and so degrading to the character of our opponents. But so it is. Men of thinking minds, of independent souls, of pure consciences, were not to be intimidated by mere clamour. This is not the country where a brief unpopularity is to obstruct the progress of any branch of free inquiry. We are too much accustomed to the storms and fluctuations of party in political life, not to know that religious agitation will speedily subside unless backed and perpetuated by civil power. Accordingly, Unitarians have had only to be firm, and thousands have rushed to their standard. Our exertions as a sect have been almost entirely negative, or perhaps re-active. We have only had to explain—to answer charges—to throw light on Scripture passages—to call Trinitarian creeds to the test—to wield the artillery of defence—and behold, how unexpected to both sides has been the effect! Calumny has goaded the supporters of the Unitarian cause into a partial concentration and systematization of effort. Pulpit denunciations have only driven inquisitive hearers into the obnoxious places of worship, and those who came to chide, remained to pray. Numbers are every day heard declaring, as soon as they lend their attention to the subject, “We have been Unitarians without knowing it, ever since we have thought.” A name of a little unusual coinage, has not altered the thing which it expresses. The name Unitarian was adopted to express what were conceived to be clear and consistent notions respecting the Deity, and notions too, to which both parties cordially assent. But, because it was comparatively a new name, though representing an old and scriptural idea, it has been erected into a bugbear. The evil, as we have just shown, like the military elephants of old, has fallen upon those who employed it as a means of intimidation. Had more caution, more prudence, more forbearance, more insight into the inevitable tendencies of human nature, more respect for the independence of mind, been exercised, long would it have been ere a new distinction was set up in the American churches, and a new seam inserted into the garment of Christ. And let not this statement be answered by the reproachful boast, “We have at least driven an



enemy from our borders. We have gotten rid of so many half Christians, imperfect Christians, and false Christians." Ah, boast not too much of that. These half Christians were at least, worth the attempt to save. But you have driven them beyond your reach. Many of them would have gladly co operated with you, in your favourite and laudable schemes for the extension of Christianity, and projects of religious benevolence. But you have refused even their subscriptions to a Bible Society.\* Besides, can you calculate on the perfect soundness of all who yet remain to you? Depend upon it, you hang together by an imaginary thread. The elements of discord are even now fermenting among you. Explain yourselves to each other, and that moment you break up into new divisions. Professor Stuart ventured on that task. Immediately the jealousy of orthodoxy was roused, and fault was found with his explanations among yourselves. Princeton scowls doubt and suspicion on Andover, and Presbyterianism glares awful surmises against Congregationalism. Calvin and Hopkins are on the point of mutual excommunication; and whenever Unitarianism shall cease, either by its insignificance, or its overwhelming success, to be a rallying point of your monstrous alliance and co-operation, you must either crush the spirit which has banished *us* from your pale, or fall into an irretrievable mass of chaotic atoms.

In the mean time, what if Unitarians were to take you at your word? What if, goaded on to despair, we should renounce in reality the very name of Christian, which you have tried to compliment away from us? When our churches should be all abandoned, when our sabbaths should be desecrated, when our whole lives should be spent in denying Christ and pouring reproaches on his name, and, instead of defending his gospel, as we now do by all the instruments which God, and reason, and education have put into our hands, we should join with the now lurking spirit of infidelity, and make a mock at religion and holiness, you might then stand aghast at the consequences of your intolerance, and not need the feeble representations of a humble Unitarian Defendant to convince you of the *unscriptural*, *unjust* and *imprudent* nature of your mode of controversy.

---

COTTON MATHER'S PSALMS.

OF the various whims which have beset men on the subject of Psalms and Hymns, none perhaps was ever more remarkable

\* As was the case in Baltimore.

than that of Cotton Mather, who thought it a great achievement to present them to the churches in blank verse. As his book is not often to be now met with, it may gratify many to see a specimen of so great a curiosity. Its title page runs thus :

‘*PSALTERIUM Americanum. The Book of Psalms, In a Translation Exactly conformed unto the Original ; but all in Blank Verse, Fitted unto the Tunes commonly used in our Churches. Which Pure offering is accompanied with Illustrations, digging for Hidden Treasures in it ; and rules to employ it upon the Glorious and Various Intentions of it. Whereto are added, Some other Portions of the Sacred Scripture, to Enrich the Cantional. By Cotton Mather.*’

There is an Introduction of thirty-five pages, which the author tells us is “to be attentively perused, that so the whole book may have the good and great end of it the more effectually accomplished.” The first part of this introduction contains an eulogium on the Book of Psalms, then follows an explanation of the plan, with the reasons for undertaking it, and its great advantages. We quote some of the most remarkable and characteristic passages.

Of the version and metre.

‘§. 3. OUR Poetry has attempted many Versions of the PSALMS, in such *Numbers and Measures*, as might render them capable of being *Sung*, in those grave *Tunes*, which have been prepared and received for our *Christian Psalmody*. But of all the more than twice Seven Versions which I have seen, it must be affirmed, That they *leave out* a vast heap of those rich things, which the Holy SPIRIT of GOD speaks in the Original Hebrew ; and that they *put in* as large an Heap of poor Things, which are intirely *their own*. All this has been merely for the sake of preserving the *Clink* of the *Rhime* : Which after all, is of small consequence unto a Generous *Poem* ; and of none at all unto the Melody of *Singing* ; But of how little then, in *Singing unto the Lord* ! Some famous pieces of Poetry, which this Refining Age has been treated withal, have been offered us in **Blank Verse**. And in **Blank Verse**, we now have the Glorious Book of PSALMS presented unto us : The PSALMS fitted unto the *Tunes* commonly used in the Assemblies of our *Zion* : But so fitted, that the *Christian Singer* has his Devotions now supplied, with ALL that the Holy SPIRIT of GOD has dictated, in this illustrious and Celestial Bestowment upon His Church in the World ; and there is NOTHING BESIDES the pure Dictates of that Holy SPIRIT imposed on him. Now, True PIETY, Thou shalt be Judge, whether such a *Divine matter* for thy *Songs* thus disencumbered from every thing that may give them any *Humane Debasements*, be not really to be preferred before any Compositions thou hast ever yet been entertain’d withal. Doubtless, the more that any are desirous to offer unto the Glorious GOD what is purely *His Own*,



and the more concerned that any are to have their *Worship* entirely Regulated and Animated, by the SPIRIT of GOD, the more agreeable to them, will be such an *Instrument of Devotion*, as is here prepared. Tho' the *Hymns* have not the Trifle of *Rhime*, as a Lace to set them off, yet they are all *Glorious within*, which is the thing that *Manly Christianity* has its eye most upon; and in the *Spiritual Songs* thus enjoyed and improved, thou mayst most hope to have the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD, who indited them, *speaking* unto thee, even such Things as *cannot be uttered*.

BUT that our *Cantional* may be furnished with a superabundance, and the Faithful be plentifully feasted with *Angels Food*, Behold, an Addition of Passages Collected in Metre, (but still as exactly translated) from some *other parts* of the Sacred Scriptures, to answer the various occasions of Christianity.'

'§. 5. Most certainly, our Translation of the PSALMS, without the Fetters of *Rhime* upon it, can be justly esteemed no prejudice to the Character of *Poetry* in the performance. For indeed, however it is now appropriated, according to the true sense of the Term, to *Rhythme* it self, a *Similis Desinentia*, or, a *likeness of sound* in the last Syllables of the Verse, is not essential. Old *Bede* will give you such a Definition of *Rhythme*, and bring other Authorities besides *Austin's* for it, that *Scaliger* thereupon holds, all *Verses* wherein Regard is had unto the *Number of Syllables*, to have a claim unto it. Be that as the Criticks on the Term shall please, our Translation is all in *Metre*; and really more tied unto *Measure*, than the *Original* appears to have been, by all the Examinations that have as yet been employ'd upon it. For, however it might be with the Song of *Moses* in *Deuteronomy*, and with the Book of *Job*, and of the *Proverbs*; My incomparable Master *Alsted* allows me to say, That in the PSALMS, *Nullum canticum sit metricis legibus astrictum, sed mera soluta sit oratio, caractere Poetico animata.*'

Of the contents and character of the book of Psalms.

'§. 6. It is a true Observation, which is made by *Folengius*, in his Commentaries on the PSALMS; *Totius Voluminis PSALMORUM Argumentum CHRISTUS*: A Glorious CHRIST is the principal Thing appearing in them. It is very certain, that in the PSALMS, the *Person*, the *Natures*, the *Vertues*, the *Humiliation*, the *Exaltation*, the *Extensive Kingdom* and the admirable *Glories* of the MESSIAH, are every where scattered and glittering, after such a manner, as calls for our Wonderment. *The Gospel according to DAVID*, compared with, *The Gospel according to MATTHEW*, affords a wonderful Entertainment. If a *Jew* would but believe the *Songs of Zion*, which once were sung in his own Land, he would soon turn a *Christian*, and would his Nation do so, it would not be long, that they should be put upon Singing them in a *Strange Land*. *Christian*, Dig in these *Mines*, and thou wilt soon be sensible of what the SAVIOUR has told thee, *Search the Scriptures, for they testify of me.* Yea, Good

Old *Hilary* has a Note, that the Book of PSALMS is a Bundle of *Keys*, which will open the Locks of all the other Scriptures. The Word, *Mictam*, is found in the Titles of several PSALMS; and Monsieur *Gousset's* Discourse upon it, has very much to demand a Reception for it. The Word signifies, *A Thing that is covered with Gold*. But another Word of the same Letters, does also signify, *A Sanctified Thing*. Our Great SAVIOUR, and His Works, are variously Exhibited, in the *Types*, and so in the *Songs*, of the *Old Testament*. The sense which concerns the *Types* is a piece of *Canvas*, on which the Holy Spirit has inlaid the *Mystical sense*, which concerns our SAVIOUR, as a *Golden Embroidery*. If *David* be the *Canvas*, in any of the *Mictams*, the Holy Spirit has inwrought a *Golden Idea* of our SAVIOUR into it, and curiously *Embroidered* it, with some of His Incomparable *Glories*. Verily, There are more *Mictams* in our *Psalter*, than those which have this Term in the *Titles* of them. They are not the only ones, that have His Unutterable *Glories* Exquisitely *Embroidered* in them. The German Divine, who wrote a Treatise, to prove, That there is not a *Chapter* in the Bible, wherein there is not a mention or a notice of our SAVIOUR, might find the *Psalter* to be the easiest part of the Bible for him to work upon. And now, when we discover our SAVIOUR in the PSALMS, we then have indeed the *Quickening Spirit* of them. In that *Light* of GOD, we see the *Light* wherein the true sense of the PSALMS is made manifest unto us. We see every thing in a new *Light*. And how sweet the *Light*! What a pleasant thing, to behold the *Sun of Righteousness* darting His Benign Beams upon us, thro' the clear and pure *Glasses*, wherewith His Holy SPIRIT here has furnished us!

'But, O *Eagle-Eye'd* Believer, when thou art Singing the *Graces*, the *Actions*, the *Sufferings*, and the *Grandeurs* of thy REDEEMER, and perhaps coming into *Thoughts* and *Frames*, that have some little Resemblance to those, which the *Prophetic Spirit* here assigns to thy REDEEMER, in the Time of His *Working out thy Salvation* for thee, what an *Angelical Dignity* art thou advanc'd unto! What a *Token for Good* hast thou, that thy REDEEMER will one day bring thee to a Consort with Him, in the *Songs* and *Joys* of the Heavenly World!

Of the annotations which accompany each psalm.

'To assist the Reader in coming at the vast *Profit* and *Pleasure*, which is to be found in this rare part of the Christian *Asceticks*, every PSALM is here *Satellied* with *Illustrations* which are not fetched from the *Vulgar Annotations*, (whereof still, Reader, continue thy esteem and thy improvement:) But are the more *Fine*, *Deep*, and *Uncommon Thoughts*, which in a course of long Reading and Thinking, have been brought in the way of the Collector. They are *Golden Keys*, to the Immense Treasures of *Truth*, which have not been commonly used: But which will enable the *conside-*



rate Reader, not only to see set in a Bright Light, the Passages to which they are annexed; but having them in his mind, he will be able to Read very many other Passages, of the Holy Book, with a greater satisfaction of mind, than ever he had before.

THERE had been a vast Addition to this Collection of *Illustrations*, if the dread of imposing a *Great Book* upon the Reader, had not so stinted and stopped the Growth of the Volumn.'

Of the prophetical character, &c. of the psalms.

'§. 9. THERE is a wonderful Thing to be observed concerning our PSALMS, which has hitherto been too much overlooked by all the *Uninspired Interpreters*; But it is a Thing which our SAVIOUR, and His *Apostles* who have quoted the PSALMS near Fifty Times, have led us into the Apprehension of. This is, That they are full of *Prophecies*; and our *Psalter* is indeed the most *Prophetical Book* in the World.

It is more particularly, but not without holy *Astonishments*!—to be observed, That the Design of the PROPHETIC SPIRIT, in the PSALMS, all along has been to describe the Sufferings of the *Jewish Nation*, as well as of the *Christian Surrogate*, under the Tyranny of *Antichrist*; and foretel the Characters and Confusions of that *Wicked One*, and of his Followers; and predict the Recovery of the *Jewish Nation* from their long Dispersion, and a long Felicity for them, and the *Converted Gentiles* associated with them, under the succeeding Reign of the MESSIAH; and that Happy state of the *New Earth*, in which, under the Influences of the *New Heavens*, there shall dwell *Righteousness*, and the *Tabernacle of GOD* shall be with Men, and He shall dwell with them, and they shall be His People, and God Himself shall be with them and be their GOD.

It may be, The Word which we render, *To the Chief Musician*, but which may be rendred, (and was of Old so,) *For the End*, may be to intimate that the PSALMS are calculated eminently with an Eye to the Things which are to be done, at that which the Bible calls, *The Time of the End*. Indeed *Jerom* long ago found *Antichrist* in the PSALMS; And *Austin* affirm'd, That the PSALMS ought all to be understood of CHRIST and His Church, and many of them refer to *After Ages*. But we may now improve in our Discoveries.

ACCORDINGLY, Upon the PSALMS, as we go along, the *Devout Reader* will find this *Key of David* here communicated unto him. And when he becomes a *Devout Singer* too, then like the *Beloved Disciple*, he shall be carried away in the Spirit into the wilderness, and be shown the Judgment of the *Great Whore* that sitteth upon many Waters. He shall also in these Visions of GOD, see the *Holy City, New Jerusalem*, coming down from GOD out of Heaven prepared as a *Bride adorned for her Husband*. Very depraved must be that Soul, that has not a relish for such Contemplations, more than for any Earthly Entertainments; and that will not most hearti-

ly say, *They're more desirable than Gold, yea, than much solid Gold ; than Honey also sweeter much, or dropping Honey-Comb.*

YEA, and who can tell, but the PSALMS put into the hands of the Jews, with so entertaining a *Commentary* thereupon, may be a powerful and perswasive Engine in the *Arm of the LORD*, for the Enlightening and Overcoming of them, to *Look on Him whom they have Pierced!* Were One to single out a present for a JEW, it should be a *Psalter* with such a *Commentary!* Which no doubt, he will consider the more Attentively because he will find his own *Rabbi's* continually brought in as *Vouchers* for it. However, It is an agreeable circumstance, to encourage our Hopes that the *Redemption of Israel*, and the *Time to favour Zion*, the set time, is coming on, in that the condition of the *Jewish Nation* as represented in the PSALMS, is now like to be more considered by the *Holy Singers* of them, than in the former Ages. When the *Holy Singers* then begin to Sing and to Praise, who knows, what *Ambushments* our GOD may set against the Powers of ANTICHRIST, and of MAHOMET; causing them to *destroy one another*, and making way for, *The Glorious Things which are spoken of thee, O Thou City of GOD!*

After the Introduction comes 'an admonition concerning the tunes'—which still further explains the execution of the work.

'An Admonition Concerning the TUNES. OUR VERSION is fitted unto all the Common TUNES, the Notes whereof are Eight and Six.

BUT some of them are accommodated for a well-known *Longer Metre*, by putting in Two Syllables of the *Black Letter* which are, without any Damage to the Truth of the Translation, found enclosed between Two such Crotchets as these, [ ] And which being left out, the Metre, with the Sense yet remaining entire is again restored unto the usual *Eight and Six*.

AND some of them are so contrived that by leaving out what is in the *Black Letter* between the Two Crotchets, [ ] which may be done without any manner of Damage, they are accommodated unto a well-known *Shorter Metre*.

THE Director of the Psalmody, need only to say *Sing with the Black Letter* or *Sing without the Black Letter*, and the Tune will be sufficiently directed.

IN the Addition to the CANTIONAL, the Singer will find, That besides what is done for the Tune which uses to go by the Name of, *The CXLVIII Psalm-Tune*, or, the *Hallelujatic Tune*; by Taking or Dropping the Two Syllables of *Black Letter*, between the Crotchets [ ] a Variety of *Other Tunes* is provided for.'

As a specimen of the work we give the 23d Psalm, both because it is short and familiar to every one.

1. MY Shepherd is th' ETERNAL God ; || I shall not be in [any] want : ||



2 In pastures of a tender grass || He [ever] makes me to lie down : ||  
To waters of tranquilities || He gently carries me, [along.] ||

3 My feeble and my wandering Soul || He [kindly] does fetch back  
again ; || In the plain paths of righteousness || He does lead [and guide]  
me along, || because of the regard He has || [ever] unto His Glorious  
Name. ||

4 Yea, when I shall walk in the Vale || of the dark [dismal] shade  
of Death, || I'll of no evil be afraid, || because thou [ever] art with  
me. || Thy rod and thy staff, these are what || yield [constant] comfort  
unto me. ||

5 A Table thou dost furnish out || richly [for me] before my face. ||  
'Tis in view of mine Enemies ; || [And then] my head thou dost an-  
noint || with fattening and perfuming Oil : || my cup it [ever] over-  
flows. ||

6 Most certainly the thing that is || Good with [most kind] Benig-  
nity, || This all the days that I do live || shall [still and] ever follow  
me ; || Yea, I shall dwell, and Sabbatize, || even to [unknown] length  
of days, || Lodg'd in the House which does belong || to [Him who's]  
the ETERNAL God. ||'

The Appendix contains other passages of scripture versified in  
the same manner. Amongst these is a part of the fifth chapter of  
Romans. The lines may consist of either eight or ten syllables.

'6 WHEN we were [wholly] destitute of strength, † This [proper]  
time, CHRIST dy'd for the profane. †

7 'Tis [very] true, One for a Just Man would † [Scarce and] with  
no small difficulty dye. † Yet peradventure some would [even] dare †  
for a [Belov'd] Good Man to suffer Death. †

8 But God, commends [in this] His Love to us † that CHRIST for  
us [altho'] yet Sinners dy'd. †

9 Much more then we [may well] infer from hence, † since by His  
Blood we're [freely] justify'd, † we shall through Him be [surely] saved  
from † the wrath to which we [justly] are expos'd. †

10 For if by His Son's Death [for it] we were † while yet Foes  
[fully] reconcil'd to God, † much more be sure now [so well] recon-  
cil'd, † we shall be saved by His [Glorious] Life. †

11 And yet this not all [of it] but we † do here-withal rejoyce in  
God [our God] † Thro' our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom [it is] † [a full]  
Atonement we have now receiv'd. †

#### The Doxology.

' NOW to that Glorious One who has † wondrously loved [sinful]  
us, † and who has made us to be Kings † as well as Priests to God  
[on High ;] † Even unto the God, who is † His Father ; [let there] unto  
Him † be Glory and Dominion † forevermore. Amen : [Amen.] †

#### The Name of God.

' JEHOVAH's [Great and] Glorious Name, † it is a Tower of

Strength : † The Righteous runs [with speed] into't ; † and there on high Sits safe. †

Exod. XXXIV. 6, 7.

So He proclaimed it [of ~~Old~~] † JEHOVAH is *His Name* ; † JEHOVAH who is [the Strong] God † forever merciful † and [very] Gracious too is He ; † to anger very Slow ; † yea, He does [very] much abound † in Grace and Truth to us. † He does [how Great] reserves of Grace † for many Thousands keep ! † Iniquity He [freely] does † dispence a pardon to. † Yea, to Transgression too [tis done] † and to all sorts of Sin ; † and if He do [in part] cut off † He will not quite cut off. †

#### WAS JESUS CHRIST A LITERAL SACRIFICE?

In reading the New Testament, especially the epistles, we meet with language like the following, in relation to "the author and finisher of our faith."—"This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, for the remission of sins."(a)—"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."(b)—"For even Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us."(c)—"Who, his own self, bare our sins in his own body on the tree."(d) "Christ also hath loved us, and given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God."(e) "We are sanctified through the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ." "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins."—"How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal spirit offered himself, without spot, to God, purge your consciences :"—"He appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many :"(f) with many other passages, not, perhaps, more strong and prominent, but of the same general character.(g)

The question very naturally arises in the mind of a serious reader of the scriptures, whether this language is to receive a *literal*, or a *figurative* construction. This is an important inquiry. If we say it is to be construed *strictly* or *literally*, the consequence seems irresistibly to follow, that Jesus Christ was offered, or that he offered himself, as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of either a part or the whole of the human race : that by his blood the Creator was rendered propitious to his creatures ; or that Jesus was, in the words of the Westminster divines(h) literally

(a) Matt. xvi. 28. Luke. xxii. 20.

(b) John i. 29.

(c) 1 Cor. v. 7.

(d) 1 Pet. ii. 24.

(e) Eph. v. 2.

(f) Heb. x. 10. 12. ix. 14. 26. 28.

(g) Vide Mark xiv. 24. 1 Cor. xi. 24. 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 John. ii. 2. iv. 10.

(h) Westminster Catechism, Qu. 25.



and properly, "a sacrifice to satisfy divine Justice:" and we must receive that as the doctrine of the scriptures, and convert it as we may to our spiritual nourishment; and to the correction and elevation of our views of the divine character and government. But if, on the other hand, we are to give all this sacrificial language a *metaphorical* or *figurative* construction, the doctrine just stated will derive from it no support; and we shall be left free to understand it in a manner which shall accord with the known and ordinary principles of the moral government of God: with those views of his character which are given us in other parts of the scripture; and with the ordinary acceptation of the same or similar language applied by the sacred writers to other persons and things.

In relation to the exposition of the scriptures there is no question more important than this now before us, whether the sacrificial language used by the sacred writers in respect to Jesus Christ is to be construed strictly or metaphorically. We ought, then, to come to the question as those who are to give an account;—who are to answer, at a future day, for our use or abuse of the treasures of heavenly wisdom which are entrusted to our charge:—for our use or abuse of those high faculties, to which the Divine Being has addressed the revelation of his character and purposes contained in the sacred volume; and as those who ought to be ready to answer for that easy credulity which believes too much, not less than for that cautious skepticism which at last believes too little.

We begin the inquiry, then, by remarking that, if the passages in the New Testament which speak of Jesus as a sacrifice to God, when *strictly* construed, shall be found to harmonize with each other, and with other plain passages of the scriptures, and with known facts, then they *may* be construed literally: although, at the same time, if, when understood *figuratively*, they be equally harmonious with known facts, with other parts of scripture, and with the usages of language, they *may* also be construed figuratively: and, in that case, it might still remain a question whether a figurative or a literal construction should prevail. But if these several passages, when construed *literally*, be found to contradict *other passages of scripture, or certain known facts, or each other*, then, the literal *must* be abandoned for a metaphorical construction.

How then, in the first place, does the effect produced upon the mind by understanding literally the several passages quoted from the New Testament, in the beginning of this article, and others like them, harmonize with language like the following? "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with

ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?"(a) "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; burnt offering and sin offering thou hast not required."(b) "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offering."(c) "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but, whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy."(d) "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him, even to our God for he will abundantly pardon."(e) These are but a few from a multitude of texts in the Old Testament either expressly declaring, or plainly implying, that our Heavenly Father, who is also our Judge, is ready to forgive the penitent merely in consideration, or on condition, of his repentance and reformation: and that a literal sacrifice, either of man or beast, considered as a religious act, or any thing more than a security, or a test, of allegiance to the Jewish theocracy, is not what God requires at the hand of his creatures.—The same impression is deepened when we find this language quoted from the Old Testament into the New: "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not;—in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast no pleasure:"(f) and when we hear Jesus himself approving and confirming the opinion of the scribe, (g) that to love God and our neighbour is more than all whole burnt offering and sacrifice.—From this latter class of texts, according to the only construction of which they appear to be capable, we infer irresistibly that pardon is ready and free to the penitent, and that it depends, in no case, upon the condition of any offering or sacrifice for sin: while, from the former class, if construed literally, the conviction seems equally irresistible that Jesus, our Lord, has become a Saviour by having offered himself up as a proper sacrifice to propitiate his Father, by expiating our sins.—Are these representations of the divine proceedings consistent with each other? Does not a literal construction of the former class of texts make them irreconcilable with the latter class?—There certainly appears to be either discord between them, or, what is no better than discord—"harmony not understood."

Secondly:—Does the doctrine that Jesus was a proper sacrifice, which seems to result from a literal construction of the

(a) Mich. vi. 7.

(b) Ps. xl. 6.

(c) Ps. li. 16.

(d) Prov. xxviii. 13.

(e) Isai. lv. 7.

(f) Heb. x. 5. 6.

(g) Mark. xii. 33.



sacrificial language applied to him in the New Testament, agree with *known facts* ?

It must be granted,—no one will deny, that if Christ was literally a sacrifice to God, *he must have been offered as such* : he must have been put to death by some one *as a sacrifice*. For the very notion of a sacrifice is that of a religious offering made by some person or persons to some God or Gods, as a religious act. There is no prayer, where there is no intent to pray. In the idea of a gift, is embraced that of a giver. There can be no sacrifice where there is not an *offering made with a sacrificial intent*. If Jesus then was a sacrifice, who sacrificed him ?

1. Was he offered, as a sacrifice, by the *Romans* ? They were his immediate executioners. It was a Roman magistrate that pronounced sentence of death against him :—a Roman soldiery that executed that sentence : a Roman spear that pierced his side. Was he offered, as a sacrifice, by the Romans ?—To this hypothesis it may be objected, in the first place, that *human sacrifices were never allowed by the established laws of Rome*. It is true that a few, very few, cases of human sacrifices can be found in Roman history during the eight hundred years from the foundation of the city to the death of Christ. Some time after Christ, during the reign of Nero or Vespasian, Pliny (a) states that human sacrifices sometimes occurred in Rome. But, before that declining period of Roman greatness and virtue, we find but a single instance in which human sacrifices were offered in Rome, to propitiate the gods : and this took place nearly two centuries before Christ, when the approach of Hannibal to its gates had thrown the city into the utmost consternation.(b) But the historian, to whom we are indebted for the knowledge of this fact, assures us that the place had never before been stained by his countrymen with the blood of human victims.(c) And from the terms of abhorrence in which the Romans, at that very time, speak of those nations which sacrificed even their prisoners of war, we learn in what detestation human sacrifices were held by that people.(d)

To the present hypothesis it may be objected, secondly, that *Rome, the city itself, was the only place in which human victims were ever offered by the Romans*. But Jesus was put to

(a) Ap. Jahn, *Archæologia Bib.* § 404.

(b) Livii Hist. Lib. xiii.

(c) Gallus et Galla, Græcus et Græca, in foro Boario, sub terra vivi demissi sunt, in locum saxo conceptum, ibi ante, hostiis humanis minime Romano sacro, imbutum"—(*ut supra*.)

(d) See the speech of Cn. Metellus before the Senate, in regard to the Galli in Asia. Livii Hist. Lib. xxxviii.

death in Judea.—A third objection is that, among the Romans, *all sacrifices were offered by their priesthood*; whereas Jesus was executed by their soldiery. And, fourthly, it may be objected that, whereas the few human victims that were offered in Rome were *buried alive*, (a) Jesus, on the contrary, suffered death *upon a cross*, a species of punishment inflicted by the Romans, only upon slaves, robbers, assassins, and those who were adjudged guilty of sedition: (b) and we know, for the evangelists inform us, that this was the crime for which our Lord was tried and, however improperly, condemned.—Was he, then, offered as a sacrifice by the Romans?

2. Was he offered, as a sacrifice, by the *Jews*. To the idea that he was, the first objection which we have to offer is, that there is no evidence in the scriptures that, in procuring his death, they had any *intent* to offer him as a sacrifice. And we must remember that a sacrificial intent is as indispensable, in order to constitute any thing a literal sacrifice, as an intent to pray, is to render any address a prayer. And secondly we object they could not have intended to offer Jesus as a sacrifice, for the following reasons. 1. The only sacrifices which the Jews ever did, or ever could offer, in the land of Canaan, without committing a crime that was construed into treason, and capitally punished as such, were those which were *expressly appointed in the Mosaic law*. That law not only does not permit human sacrifices, but it repeatedly forbids them; (c) and abounds with the most fearful denunciations against them. 2. All the bloody or animal sacrifices which were required or allowed by Moses were either *piacular*, such as were offered in expiation of trespasses, or sins; or *eucharistical*, such as were offered as testimonials of gratitude. All these must be *animals* of certain kinds, distinctly specified. With these facts before our eyes, it is a needless waste of labour to prove that our Lord could not have been regarded by the Jews as a literal sacrifice, either eucharistical, or piacular:—either as an expression of gratitude, or as an atonement for sin.—3. A third reason why the Jews could not have considered Jesus as a sacrifice, of any kind, is that, from before the entrance of the Israelites into the land of Canaan, they were strictly and re-

(a) Jahn, Arch. Bib. § 404.

(b) Jahn, Arch. Bib. § 261. *ibi* laudata.

(c) Levit. xviii. 21. Deut. xviii. 10. 2 Kings xvii. 17, 18, Ps. cvi. 37. 38. 40. Deut. xii. 31.—If then, Jesus *had* been offered by the Jews, *animo sacrificandi*, with the most sacrificial intent, the offering would have been a capital crime by their law, and, of course, not an acceptable sacrifice with God, who gave their law; for he accepts no sacrifice of which the very offering is guilty. To even a heathen moralist it was obvious “*nullam scelere religionem exsolvi* :”—that no religious duty is discharged by the perpetration of a crime. Livii Hist. Lib. ii.—



peatedly forbidden, under penalty of excision, to offer any sacrifices whatever, except in *such place as the Lord should appoint for that purpose.*(a) Before the building of the temple, the place of sacrifice seems not to have been permanently fixed; but the altar was raised whenever the tabernacle stood, or wherever the ark of the Covenant, which was the great sanctuary of the Israelitish religion, happened to rest.(b) The object of this law, from which there was no exception, except that a *prophet* had authority to dispense with it,(c) was to guard the worshippers, and even the priests of Jehovah, from all temptation and all opportunity of relapsing into the idolatry by which they were surrounded, and to which they were so prone. This law was, it is true, often violated by wicked monarchs before, and even after, the building of the temple. It was occasionally violated even down to the time of the transportation into Babylon; and, indeed, the transgression of this law was the principal cause of the transportation. But, after the return of the Jews from Babylon, they observed that law so faithfully, that not an instance of its violation in Judea(d) can be shewn till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. And it is owing to the destruction of the temple and altar in Jerusalem, that all Jewish sacrifices have ever since been suspended. From the return of the Jews from Babylon to this moment, the offering of a sacrifice, of any kind, in any other place than the altar and Temple in Jerusalem, would have appeared to them as an inexpiable offence, the most shocking of all abominations. But Jesus "suffered without the gate."(e)

Again, 4. As with the Romans, so it was, especially after the captivity, with the Jews: all their bloody sacrifices must be offered *by the hands of their own priesthood.*(f) The interference of strangers, and especially of their enemies, with the offering of their sacrifices, would have been regarded by the Jews with the utmost horror. Yet Jesus died by the hands of the idolatrous Romans, and the Jews were clamorous that he *might* die by their hands. Did they, then, consider him as a sacrifice? Could they have so considered him? If in any sense, it can be said that Jesus was sacrificed by the Jews, it can be only in a

(a) Levit. xvii. 1—9.—especially vs. 8, 9. Deut. xii. 5—28. Levit. xxvi. 30.

(b) Vide Michaelis, Mos. Law, § 188. Jahn Arch. Bib. § 376.

(c) 1 Sam. xiii. 8—14, xvi. 1—5. 1 Kings xviii. 21—40.

(d) The case of Onias, in Egypt, (Joseph. Ant. Jud. xiii. 3 § 3. Michaelis Mos. Law, § 188.) could hardly be considered as an exception, had the observation been general. But it is no exception, restricted, as the statement is, to Judea.

(e) Heb. xiii. 12.

(f) Jahn Arch. Bib. § 378.

figurative sense. It may be said that they sacrificed him to their envy, to one of the most bitter and malignant of their own passions; but not to the God of their fathers, the God of holiness and mercy, either as an expression of their gratitude or as an expiation of their sins.

3.—Did Jesus, then, sacrifice *himself*?—It will not be denied that, as, at one time, it might be said that the Jews sacrificed our Lord to their envy, so, at another, it may be said, that he sacrificed himself upon the altar of his duty, or of benevolence, or of pity to the human race. But this is figurative language: and by it we mean that he devoted himself, gave up his life, rather than abandon the arduous and painful offices which he had been commissioned to fill;—the offices of our Teacher, example, and Saviour. But this metaphorical sacrifice is the result of a *metaphorical* construction of the passages under consideration. A literal construction of those passages makes the Saviour not only a literal sacrifice, but the greatest of all literal sacrifices. As such, we now ask, did he offer himself?

To the idea that he did, it may be objected, 1. That he never told his disciples that he intended to offer himself, he never gave them to understand that he considered himself—as a sacrifice. On the contrary, he did tell his disciples that he came, among other things, to give his life, not a sacrifice, but a *ransom* for many. On this fact we have something more to offer shortly. 2. We may object to the supposition that Jesus offered himself as a literal sacrifice to God, in any sense, the known fact, to which all the evangelists testify, that he did not offer himself at all. While he did not shun death, if it lay where duty led him, he did not seek it. He was followed, arrested, led away to trial and to death. He did not court danger but rather sought to avoid it.—When we see the Roman Curtius<sup>(a)</sup> voluntarily leaping into a gulf to appease the offended gods of his country and his worship;—or the two Decii, father and son,<sup>(b)</sup> after deliberately devoting themselves as victims, and, as such, receiving consecration from the priesthood, voluntarily rush into the thickest ranks of their enemies, and fall by their swords, we say that *here* are men who offer themselves a sacrifice to their country and its gods. We admire their patriotism; and, while we lament their superstition, we give them credit for a lofty, though perhaps misguided, devotion. But how different from the conduct of these men was that of Jesus of Nazareth! They voluntarily plunged into the abyss, that they might be destroyed. He cast himself upon the current of his duty, and was borne

(a) Liv. Hist. Lib. vii.

(b) Id. Lib. viii. x.



on by that. They sought death. He merely did not shrink from it, when called by duty to meet it. They actively gave themselves to the destruction which they might have escaped. He passively, though magnanimously, submitted to that which appeared inevitable. So far from courting his sufferings and seeking death, his prayer to his Heavenly Father was reiterated and earnest, that, if it were possible, the cup which was preparing for him might pass from him. How then can it be said that Jesus offered *himself* to God as a literal sacrifice of any kind?—And if it is a fact, that he did not offer himself,—if it is a fact that neither the Romans nor the Jews offered him—as a sacrifice, by whom was he so offered?—Is not the literal construction of the sacrificial language relating to him, contradicted by so many known facts, that we ought to hesitate before we adopt it?

Thirdly. Do not many of the texts in which Jesus is spoken of as a sacrifice, when literally construed, contradict *each other*, no less than other scriptures, and known facts?—“Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast thou prepared me.”(a) For what?—A *sacrifice*! to be made an *offering*!—Again; we have just remarked that although Jesus never spoke of himself as a *sacrifice*, yet he did tell his disciples that he came to give his life a *ransom* for many.(b) Now, though, in the metaphorical use of language, we may say, of the same thing, now, that it is a sacrifice, and now a ransom, we are not allowed that license when we are using language in its literal sense. Strictly speaking, a sacrifice is one thing, and a ransom is another, so different that one can neither be used nor mistaken for the other. If, then, the body, or the blood, or the life of Jesus was, either strictly or figuratively, a *ransom*,—as he declares that it was, either strictly or figuratively,—it could not have been a literal *sacrifice*.

Again.—Does the writer to the Hebrews (c) in one of the texts quoted at the beginning of this article, say “This man, after that he had once offered a *sacrifice for sins*?” Paul, in another of these texts says: “for even Christ our *passover*, is sacrificed for us.”(d)—We have already seen that all bloody sacrifices under the Mosaic law, the only sacrifices in Judea that were not idolatrous, were either *piacular* or *eucharistical*. All *sacrifices for sins* were *piacular*. The *passover* however was *eucharistical*.(e) The literal construction of one of these

(a) Heb. x. 5. (b) Matt. xx. 28. (c) Heb. x. 12. (d) 1 Cor. v. 7.

(e) “Ad recolenda majora beneficia divina instituta erant festa *paschatis*, pentecostis, et tabernaculorum”—Jahn, Arch. Bib. † 353. Vide et † 354.

texts makes Jesus a piacular sacrifice, an offering made as an expiation or atonement for sin. The literal construction of another makes him an eucharistical sacrifice. But if he be, either strictly or metaphorically, as one text represents him, an eucharistical sacrifice, an acknowledgment of divine mercy,—he cannot be as the letter of another would seem to make him, a piacular sacrifice,—a satisfaction of divine justice.

Once more: "This, says our Lord, is my blood of the New Covenant."<sup>(a)</sup>—By this we are probably to understand that the blood or death of Jesus was the ratification, sanction, or seal,—the evidence or surety—of that New Covenant of which he was the Mediator. But the animal that was slain or sacrificed, among all Oriental nations, in ratification of a Covenant, was never considered as a piacular, but always as an eucharistical sacrifice. <sup>(b)</sup> They were not indeed exclusively sacrifices of thanksgiving, as were some others: but they were directly opposed to expiatory offerings. If Jesus, therefore, was literally a sacrifice of either of these three kinds,—*federal*, a sacrifice in ratification of a covenant;—*paschal*, an offering made at the passover;—or *piacular*, a sacrifice for sins;—he could not have been either of the other two. If he was a *paschal*; he could have been neither a piacular nor a federal sacrifice: if a *piacular*; neither a federal nor paschal: if a *federal*; neither a paschal nor a piacular. But a literal construction of the passages in question, makes him either or all of them indifferently. Is not this alone sufficient proof that he was literally neither? Is it not sufficient proof that a metaphorical construction of these texts must be adopted, since a literal construction arrays them in such direct contradiction to each other, to the plain declarations of God in other parts of the scriptures, and to known incontrovertible facts?

Before answering these questions affirmatively we ought perhaps to pause, and ask ourselves whether it is according to the authorized usages of language to give a figurative interpretation to expressions so direct, and apparently so plain, as the sacred writers use in most of the texts which we are considering.—This is undoubtedly a proper inquiry, and it ought to be faithfully pursued. At the same time, however, we ought to look back upon the ground that we have already gone over, and seriously consider that, having shewn that a literal interpretation of the texts in question makes them directly contradictory to other passages of scripture,—to known facts—and to them-

(a) Matt. xxvi. 28.

(b) Jahn Arch. Bib. § 383. supported by Exod. xxiv. 4—8.



selves ;—no other alternative now remains to us than either to give them a figurative construction, or to reject them as false, because thus contradictory.

Bearing this consideration in mind, then, do we not find expressions similar to many of these in question, in ordinary use, in our own times, in the frigid zone of an occidental and modern language ? We say, of the intemperate man, that he *gives himself up* to his appetites ; of the sensualist, that he *sacrifices himself* upon the altar of his passions : and by this we mean that they abandon themselves respectively to vicious indulgences though their vices are their destruction. The parent *suffers for his children*. The patriot, with a generous devotion, *gives himself up as a sacrifice* to his country, when he endangers and loses his all—his life itself, in its defence. But by this language no one understands that the parent, or patriot, literally offers himself as a propitiatory sacrifice for his family or his country. Civil liberty is secured, even in its best estate, by the *sacrifice* of our natural rights. The great cause of philanthropy is served only by the philanthropist's *taking upon himself* a part of the *sufferings* of those whom he travels and toils and watches to bless.—Yet, by the use of such language, nobody is led into the belief of a literal sacrifice, or a literal vicarious suffering. As we go back into the depths of antiquity we find, in writers of the highest authority, language still more bold, though of the same general character. Says Cicero, speaking of his efforts and privations in saving his country from the conspiracy of Catiline,—“ In this season of your alarm I have passed over many things in silence : I have made many concessions : I have undergone much : *I have healed many of the public maladies, as it were by my own sufferings.*” (a) Again, “ If the consulship be granted me only on this condition, that I endure every kind of affliction, and pain, and even torture, I will bear them not only with fortitude but cheerfully, provided that *by my sufferings I may secure the dignity and salvation of yourselves and of Rome.*” (b) How far is this language below Isaiah's : “ The chastisement of our peace was upon him ; and by his stripes we are healed.” (c)

Josephus, an author of the same nation, and nearly of the same age, with the writers of the New Testament, uses language in re-

(a) “ Ego multa tacui, multa pertuli, multa concessi, multa meo quodam dolore, in vestro timore, sanavi.”—*Cic. Orat. iv. in Catilinam. Vide Cleric. in Esai. liii. 5.*

(b) Mihi, si hæc conditio Consulatus data est, ut omnes acerbitates, omnes dolores, cruciatusque perferrem ; feram, non solum fortiter, sed etiam libenter, dummodo meis laboribus vobis populoque Romano dignitas salusque pariat. —*Cicero, ap. Cleric. ut supra.*

(c) Isai. liii. 5.

lation to the fortitude shown by the Maccabees, under their tortures, and the benefits derived to Israel from their sufferings, which equals, if it does not transcend, the strongest expressions of substitution and expiatory suffering used by the sacred writers in speaking of our Lord. After his long account of their firmness and their death, under the tortures inflicted by command of Antiochus, he says: "These men, therefore, having been sanctified of God, have attained this glory—(of standing by the throne of God and enjoying a happy eternity)—and not this glory only; but it was through them, having become, as it were, *the ransom of a sinful people*, that the enemies of our nation were defeated,—the tyrant punished—and the dishonour of our country wiped away:—and, *by the blood of these pious men*, and *the propitiation of their death*, divine Providence effected the salvation of oppressed Israel." (a) This last example of the figurative use of sacrificial language, being from a Jewish writer, who is speaking of men that devoted themselves upon the altar of their religion and their country, is particularly illustrative of the language of other Jewish writers when speaking of one who also devoted himself to dishonour and death for the benefit of his brethren; and who also, having been sanctified by the Father, (b) was, in consideration of his obedience unto death, highly exalted by him, (c) and crowned with glory and honour. (d) But we need not go abroad for examples of the use of sacrificial language in relation to men and things, to the full as bold and as strong as the sacred writers use in relation to Christ. The sacred writers themselves, especially those of them who most frequently use this language in respect to Christ, use it not less frequently in connexion with other subjects; and that, too, without ever having been understood as speaking literally.

Does Peter say that "*Christ suffered for us*?" (e) He suffered in such a sense that "*we also may follow his steps*." But, if he suffered as a literal sacrifice to God, as an expiation for sin, does it not follow that we must suffer for others as a sin offering—that the servants to whom these words are addressed, should suffer as a sacrifice to God for their masters' sins? Did *Christ* "*become poor, or live in poverty, for our sake*?" (f) Paul, also, "*endured all things for the elect's sake* that they also might obtain salvation." (g) Can a stronger text be produced, from the New Testament, to prove that *Christ* was delivered to death *for our sake*, than this of Paul, to a very different purpose: "For we,

(a) Vide Josephus "De Maccabæis," § 17.---Vide et 2 Maccab. vii. 37, 38. in the LXX.

(b) John, x. 36.

(c) Phil. ii. 8. 9.

(d) Heb. ii. 9.

(e) 1 Pet. ii. 21.

(f) 2 Cor. viii. 9.

(g) 2 Tim. ii. 10.



who live, *are always delivered unto death for Jesus sake.*" (a) Did Christ suffer *in our behalf*, or *for our sake*? Paul says to the Philippians "*unto you it is given, in behalf of Christ, not only to believe in him, but to suffer for his sake.*" Does he say to the Christians at Ephesus that "*Christ hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God?*" (b) To those at Rome (c) he says, "*I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.*" To the Philippians he says, (d) "*If I be offered upon the sacrifice of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all:*" and to Timothy he says, when he feels that his labours must soon close, "*I am now ready to be offered,*" or more correctly, *I am already poured out as an offering.* (e) What is meant, by this language, but that the aged apostle was exhausted, that he had worn himself out, in the discharge of the duties of the office to which he had been called of God? Can we suppose that Paul considered himself as a literal sacrifice? that he presented himself, or besought the Roman Christians to present themselves to God, as a propitiatory offering? If not, why should we not give a metaphorical construction to similar, but not stronger language, in relation to Christ; who also fell a victim,—a nobler and a spotless victim,—to the cause that had been committed to him?—Paul was the minister of Christ unto the Gentiles, that the *offering up of the Gentiles* might be acceptable, being sanctified by the same Holy Spirit. (f) Has Christ *given himself for us a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour*? (g) The charity, which the Philippians sent by Epaphroditus to Paul, was *an odour of sweet smell, a sacrifice, acceptable, well pleasing unto God.* (h) Were the Gentiles offered as a literal sacrifice to God? Do we give a strict construction to that language which calls the charitable contributions of Christians to each other a sacrifice? If not, it is according to the usages of language, and especially of the language of the New Testament, to apply to persons and things indifferently, and in a figurative sense, the language which was strictly applicable to the proper sacrifices of the Mosaic law.

In as much, then, as the sacrificial language of the New Testament when applied to all persons *may be*, and applied to all except Jesus *must be*, understood figuratively; it certainly *may be* so understood when applied to him. And, in as much as a literal construction of that language in the several texts where he is the subject of discourse, would make those texts contradictory to

(a) 2 Cor. iv. 2.

(d) Phil. ii. 17.

(g) Eph. v. 2.

(b) Eph. v. 2.

(e) 2 Tim. iv. 6.

(h) Phil. iv. 18.

(c) Rom. xii. 1.

(f) Rom. xv. 16.

other passages of scripture, to facts, and to themselves, we conclude that the metaphorical sense *must* be adopted.

Or shall we, disregarding the opposition of these texts when literally construed to each other, to plain declarations of scripture, and to multiplied scriptural as well as other historical facts—shall we still insist upon construing them literally? and, giving up our reason and our faith to the consequences of such a construction, shall we believe, as the letter would compel us to believe, that our Lord was not only a real sacrifice, but every sort of sacrifice?—that he is now, a *federal* or testamentary sacrifice, (a) whose blood is to ratify a covenant: now, a *piacular* offering, whose blood is to make an atonement for sin: (b) and now, a *passover*, to commemorate our deliverance from sin and death? Shall we believe now, that he *was* offered, (c) and now that he offered up (d) or sacrificed (e) *himself*? Shall we believe that he is now the offering, and now the priest who makes the offering? (f) If we are prepared to plunge into depths of belief like these, looking to the letter as the only guide of our faith, what shall restrain us from going on, and believing that Jesus is a *vine*, (g) and a *way*, (h) and a *door*, (i) and a *corner-stone*; (j) and all this, at the same time that he is a *shepherd* (k) and a *lion* (l) and the bright and morning *star*? (m) Are we prepared to adopt a system of construing the scriptures which shall lead us into such gross inconsistencies? and shall we delude ourselves with the idea that these are the deep things of God? Shall we follow the letter, when it will compel us to believe that our Lord has assumed so many different forms, and that he acted and suffered in so many inconsistent characters, at the moment when, on the same principle, we are required to believe that Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever? (n)

Shall we not rather believe that, in much of what the early disciples of Jesus said of him, they spoke, as all orientals speak, in a highly figurative style? Regarding him as the greatest of the prophets, and the most illustrious of the teachers who had come from God, was it wonderful that they should apply to him every title of dignity and glory? Recently converted, as they had been, from a religion abounding in sacrifices, was it not natural for them, especially when addressing those who had been edu-

(a) Matt. xxvi. 28. Mark xiv. 24. Luc. xxii. 20. 1 Cor. xi. 24.

(b) 1 Pet. ii. 24. 2 Cor. v. 21. Eph. v. 2.

(c) Heb. ix. 28.

(d) Heb. ix. 14.

(e) Heb. ix. 26.

(f) Heb. ix. 11.

(g) John xv. 1.

(h) John xiv. 6.

(i) John x. i. 7. 9.

(j) Eph. ii. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 6.

(k) John x. 11.

(l) Rev. v. 5.

(m) Rev. ii. 28.

(n) Heb. xiii. 8.



cated in the same religion, to speak of their new faith in terms which had been familiar to them from their childhood. Admiring, as they did, the virtues of their Lord, and deeply affected, as they must have been, by the sufferings by which those virtues were called forth and proved; their feelings must have been excited, whenever he was the subject of their thoughts or their discourse, to more than their ordinary warmth, and to a neglect of the cold and studied correctness of the careful rhetorician. When they considered that their master had fallen a victim to his own fidelity, and to the envy of others, what was more natural than that they should speak of him as a sacrifice?—a sacrifice, now of one kind and now of another, according to their own circumstances at the time they were speaking, or to the other subjects of their discourse, or to the particular benefit which had resulted to the world from what he had done or suffered? When, either in prophetic vision, or in a rational anticipation of what must be effected by the religion of Jesus, they looked forward to the ultimate reformation of mankind—to the dispelling of the darkness of ignorance and sin from the face of the earth, what more natural than that they should call him “the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.” If the new covenant is sealed or ratified by his death, his is “the blood of the covenant,” and the gospel itself is “the new covenant in his blood.” If an apostle is comparing the new converts to a mass of unleavened bread, this bread, being eaten at the passover, brings that festival to his mind; but Christ was crucified on the eve of the feast of unleavened bread; and then “Christ is himself our passover who was sacrificed for us.”

The same kind of construction will guide us in other similar passages, and enable us to preserve, unimpeached, the best faculties of our nature, our reverence for the sacred oracles, and, above all, the adorable excellence of the divine character. It will enable us more correctly to understand the documents of our religion, more gratefully to rejoice in the light which they shed upon our path here, and upon our prospects hereafter, and more readily to convert to our spiritual nourishment and strength, the bread of life which came down from heaven in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

## REMARKS ON 1 CORINTHIANS ii. 14.

[The following remarks from an esteemed correspondent may serve to illustrate a difficult and frequently misinterpreted passage of scripture.]

"BUT THE NATURAL MAN RECEIVETH NOT THE THINGS OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD; FOR THEY ARE FOOLISHNESS UNTO HIM; NEITHER CAN HE KNOW THEM, BECAUSE THEY ARE SPIRITUALLY DISCERNED."—1 Cor. ii. 14.

THESE words have been frequently understood as denoting the natural inaptitude or incapacity of man to receive and discern the truths of religion; and they have been regarded by many christians as an evidence of the corrupt and disordered nature of man before it is regenerated by the special influences of the spirit of God. A candid examination of the passage, however, may show that this is not its meaning, and point out the important instruction it really conveys.

The word *natural* in this passage, has no relation to the condition or character of men by nature, or as they are formed by the hand of their Creator. If we consider simply the nature of man, we shall find in him nothing worthy of blame or deserving of punishment; nothing, which violates any law, or is opposed to goodness; for that nature is the work of God, and the works of his hand are good. But rational beings, who are formed aright, may become sinful by the voluntary perversion of those powers, which were originally pure. This is admitted by all to have been the case with the angels, who sinned, and with our first parents. The single fact then, that mankind betray an inclination to sin, when they become capable of moral action, is no proof of any thing wrong in their nature, or in their original constitution. If temptation could operate on angels in heaven, and on Adam and Eve in Paradise, without a sinful nature, then it may operate on mankind in the early period of their existence, without indicating, that they are sinners by birth, or are born with depraved hearts.

Our first inquiry is, what is meant by the *natural* man? The answer, which most readily suggests itself to many, and with which they rest contented, is, that it denotes man, as he comes from his Creator, as he is born, or created. And at this answer from one, who confines himself wholly to the import of the word as it stands in our translation, and has no other means of understanding its sense, we should not have occasion to be much surprised. But he, who undertakes to be a teacher, and should quote this passage as a proof of what man is in his natural state, convicts himself of ignorance, or of something worse, for which he has no excuse. The truth is, the word here translated *natural*,



(agreeably to the interpretation of Doddridge, Macknight and many judicious critics) has no relation to the character or condition of men, as they are formed, or as they come into the world. It denotes not what they are by nature, nor any part of their original constitution, but what they are by the *perversion or abuse of their nature, or a character, which is strictly unnatural*. The word should have been rendered *sensual, vicious, corrupt*; and it denotes the character of those, who are under the dominion of base and depraved passions, who have rendered themselves slaves to their animal propensities, and who have no higher or holier object than the gratification of their animal appetites. We have the same word twice, at least, rendered in this manner in our common translation. It is said in James, "This wisdom descendeth not from above; but is earthly, *sensual*, (or *natural* ψυχικος) devilish." Jude, speaking of those whom he terms ungodly sinners, declares, "These be they, who separate themselves, *sensual*, not having the spirit." No intimation is given, that this term is applicable to mankind in a state of infancy, or that it describes their natural state or character. On the other hand, the period of childhood and youth is peculiarly favourable for receiving the things of the spirit of God; the instructions and precepts he has given in his word. Then is the mind most susceptible of those impressions, which the truths of the gospel are designed and fitted to produce. Then is there the least opposition to the genuine influence of Christianity. As yet those evil habits are not formed, which are subdued with so much difficulty, that the change is compared to the "Ethiopian changing his skin, and the leopard his spots." But when men have corrupted their ways, voluntarily abused or perverted their nature and faculties; when they have indulged their vicious inclinations, and by indulgence converted them into habits; it becomes exceedingly difficult for them to return to the right way: their aversion to the gospel acquires strength; and they become more and more insensible to the influence of religion and virtue. The course, which they pursue, marks their dislike to the gospel; they undervalue its instructions, promises, and rewards; the consolations it yields here, and the everlasting honors, which it encourages the righteous to expect hereafter. While this is their disposition, they cannot perceive the value, beauty, or excellence of those truths, which the scriptures unfold.

This leads to a second inquiry, very important to a correct interpretation of this passage. In what respects is the sensual, or vicious man incapable of knowing the things of the spirit of God? i. e. as we may understand it, of apprehending the truths and objects of religion? Has he any want of capacity of know-

ing all, that it is required of him to know? Is there any natural blindness of understanding, which in the use of appointed means he is unable to remove? The reason of things and the plain declarations or deductions of scripture show, that there is not. He has all the powers of a moral agent, and is capable of performing all his duty. The text, and other similar passages imply no more, than that men, *while they remain sensual, or vicious*, cannot relish the things of religion, cannot love God, and cheerfully perform the duties of piety and morality. There is a strong distaste, or indisposition of mind towards these duties. No man can at the same time pursue two courses; or cherish two states of affection, so opposite as those of vice and virtue, of sin and holiness. To choose one of them is to abandon the other. To have a taste for one implies a dislike of the other. He therefore, who prefers to gratify his sinful propensities, cannot, while this is his character, cordially receive the doctrines, cultivate the spirit, or perform the duties of Christianity. This, it may be presumed, will be admitted by all, who consider the subject. But does the text, or any similar passage denote that wicked men have no control over their hearts, dispositions, characters, or actions? Does it imply the least necessity, that they remain as they are till some supernatural influence takes place within them? Does it imply, that they are dependent on God for the dispositions of their hearts and the obtaining of their salvation in any different sense from that, in which they are dependent on him for other blessings? This were virtually to deny the moral agency and accountability of man. If it were said the idle man cannot procure the comforts of life for himself or his family, nor can he know the pleasures and advantages of industry, would any one understand from this, that the idle man cannot become diligent, or that he has no control over his own actions? What is said of him relates to him only as an idle man. Whatever may have been his indisposition to labor, whatever difficulties may attend a change of his habits, who can question, that it is still in his power to cease from his idleness, and to acquire the taste and habit of virtuous industry. If we did not believe, that all this was possible, we could not blame his indolence. We never blame a man for a particular course, or action, if we know there is an insuperable obstacle to his doing otherwise. The same principle in its utmost extent is to be applied to this subject. The sensual, or wicked man cannot receive or know, the things, that are revealed by the spirit of God. But does he necessarily remain a vicious man? Has he no power to reform? Is he endued with no capacity to form within himself a different disposition and character? He is not bound with fetters, which he cannot break;



and then commanded to walk. The commands of God are reasonable, and require no more than we can perform; they all imply the possession and exercise of our moral powers. His commands are, "Wash you: make you clean: put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes: cease to do evil; learn to do well." "Make you a new heart, and a new spirit, for why will you die?" "Awake thou, that sleepest, and arise from the dead; and Christ shall give you light." "Repent and be converted. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts." Now in view of these commands, let me ask, does God require what man can perform, or what he cannot perform? In other words, are his commands just or unjust? It is not to be supposed, that there can be a moment's doubt upon this subject. The commands of God show with perfect plainness what men ought to do, and what they can do. There is a certainty upon this subject, which resembles the consciousness we have of our own existence, and which by no sophistry or metaphysical reasoning can be diminished.

But perhaps it is asked, are we not dependent on God for a new heart? Undoubtedly we are; but in the same manner, as we are dependent on him for the common blessings of life. Are not all the comforts we enjoy, the fruits of his unmerited goodness? Is there any thing, which we possess, derived from any source, but his rich and exhaustless bounty? Do we breathe his air, do we walk his earth, do we exert a thought but by the breath, and strength, and understanding he has given us? Does any one imagine, that we can procure our sustenance without his agency? There is nothing more absolute and entire than our dependence upon Him; but we are not to separate the gifts of his grace from the bounties of his providence; and let our dependence for the one illustrate our dependence for the other. Our dependence in temporal things does not interfere with the discharge of our whole duty in relation to them. We are able to provide for ourselves in every sense, in which this is required. If we pursue the course which is pointed out, God will prosper our efforts. We are not able to command a crop of corn into existence—nor is this our duty; but we are able to pursue the method, which divine wisdom has appointed for the attainment of this and other comforts of life. There is a course equally plain with regard to our spiritual interests. We are not able without divine grace to form ourselves to holy dispositions and virtuous habits. But that grace is uniformly granted to them, that seek it, and who use the established means of moral and religious improvement.

It is of great importance to our humility and piety that we realize this dependence on God for the assistances of his spirit to form us to virtuous dispositions and habits, which are the indispensable qualifications for future happiness. But it is equally important for us to remember, that this assistance is granted in answer to prayer, and in co-operation with faithful endeavours; that if we diligently employ the means, we shall not fail of the end. We must be careful to entertain upon this subject views worthy of God, of his goodness and moral government, and of ourselves, as rational, free and accountable creatures. We are taught from the lips of the Saviour, "that if any man will do the will of God, he shall know of his doctrine;" he shall have a practical and saving conviction of Christian truth. This promise of Jesus Christ affords the best illustration of the passage we have been considering from St. Paul; and may guard it from the false interpretation, by which it has been obscured. It teaches us, that there is nothing but sin, that shall darken the light of God's truth in our souls: that it is not our nature as it comes from God, but our vices, our evil habits and our sensual lives, that confound our moral vision and give us over to undiscerning minds. "A good life," says the eloquent Taylor, "is the best way to understand wisdom and religion; because by the experiences and relishes of religion there is conveyed to them a sweetness, to which all wicked men are strangers; there is in the things of God to them, that practice them, a deliciousness, that makes us love them; and that love admits us to God's cabinet, and wonderfully clears the understanding in purifying the heart. So long as we know God only in the way of man, by contentious learning, by arguing and disputing, we see nothing but the shadow of him, and in that shadow we meet with many dark appearances, little certainty and much conjecture. But when we know him with the eyes of holiness, and the intuition of gracious experiences, with an obedient temper, and in the peace of enjoyment, we shall hear what we never heard, and see what our eyes never saw. And then the mysteries shall be open to us, and clear as the windows of the morning. And this is the meaning of that fine passage of the apostle, 'Awake, thou, that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light;' and we may add, of that declaration of the prophet, "None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand."



STAPFER'S ADDRESS AT THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS  
BIBLE SOCIETY.

At the third anniversary of the *Protestant Bible Society of Paris*, held on the 16th of April, 1822, a long address was made by M. Stapfer, in which he examined at large that article of the Constitution which forbids the circulation of any except the established translations of the Scriptures. He first stated the objections to it, and then urged the reasons which seem to prove its expediency. A translation has been made by a friend of parts of this speech, which we here offer to our readers. It is too long to be inserted entire.

When at the last annual meeting of our society, I had the honour of presenting to it some considerations suited to the objects which it proposes to effect, I undertook to defend that clause in the first article of our statutes which imposes on us the obligation of circulating the Holy Scriptures *without note or comment*.

Invited to perform the same honourable task to-day, I design to furnish a sequel to those remarks, then received with so much indulgence, and to offer to your attentive consideration, that article in our regulations, which forbids the circulation of any version of the Holy Scriptures, excepting that *commonly received and used in our churches*;—a clause common to us, with all Bible Societies; and which seems to circumscribe in an injurious manner the sphere of their labours, as it prevents them from applying some of the numerous means, provided by their zeal and munificence, to the important work of *improving the common translations*.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is so very desirable an object to see the translations of our holy books, by their fidelity, clearness, conciseness and energy of style, approaching nearer and nearer to the Spirit of their divine original; the wish of contributing to such an object by well directed efforts, and well conducted sacrifices, seems so naturally to suggest itself to those associations who are so zealously devoted to the service of the sacred volume, and who have such powerful means at their disposal; that the restriction which prevents them from pursuing so inviting an object, is to many enlightened persons, a subject at once of astonishment and regret.

What friend of religion is there, anxious to see the books which are its fountain and support, received with respect, and their worth duly appreciated, who has not experienced a very painful sensation at finding preserved in the common translation phrases which have become vulgar, terms which have lost their significance, by the changes of language and the affectations inseparably connected with an advanced state of cultivation, idiomatic phrases, obsolete and obscure expressions, which disturb his devotions with unpleasant associations, and especially with the apprehension that they may give rise to unhappy mistakes, or make injurious impressions,

and, in the mind of light or evil disposed readers, diminish the veneration due to the word of God! And what well informed and sincere Christian is there, who has not felt still greater pain, when in difficult passages, our translations present him with an ancient interpretation, which supplies the infidel with a weapon, which might be happily snatched from his hands by a more modern and rational explanation?

Why should not Bible Societies feel it their duty, to make those changes in the received versions, which the progress of language and taste demands? Why should they not thus endeavour to put within reach of the people, the result of the many researches undertaken in the last century, for illustrating the text and correcting the versions of our Holy Books? By neglecting this duty, by refusing to enter into the salutary design of making known to ordinary Christians, to whom all access to the treasures of Biblical Literature is closed, so many valuable discoveries, so many fortunate conjectures, which by throwing new light on obscure texts, may dissipate part of the clouds collected by ignorance, presumption, or knavery; do they not become in a degree responsible for the mistakes, errors, and fatal doubts, which they might have contributed to remove or prevent, but the duration and pernicious influence of which, they thus extend?

I do not imagine that I have weakened the arguments of those enlightened and pious persons who desire an improved version of the Bible. I am far from denying the advantages which Religion would derive from the accomplishment of their wishes. I would still less forget the excellent intentions, and distinguished merits of the authors of some new translations into the vulgar tongue, or refuse the just tribute of gratitude and praise due to their labours.

What methods will it be possible to adopt on this subject for the benefit of the church and the furtherance of religious instruction? It is ardently to be desired that a subject so fruitful in important and delicate considerations, should occupy the thoughts and pens of those friends of religion who unite sufficient knowledge with long experience. In order to treat a subject properly which can be viewed in so many different lights, we must not only consider the qualifications necessary to produce a translation answering to the present state of Literature and Theology, but we must also inquire into the best means of reconciling these improvements with the regard we owe to the feelings of those worthy persons of all denominations, to whom habit has so endeared the old translations, that their most praise-worthy desires are awakened, their most virtuous emotions indissolubly associated with forms of expression and even arrangements of words, both undoubtedly susceptible of improvement.



In the mean time, there would be another question to be considered. A translation is in itself a kind of commentary, since it gives the impression which the translator himself receives from a book, and expresses clearly or obscurely the sense which he attaches to each passage. The more literal, I had almost said the more servile he is, the more nearly he conforms his expressions to those of the original, making himself a passive translator, a mere interpreter, and not a commentator, the better calculated his work will be to be circulated by the Bible Societies, as it will not expose them to violate the law forbidding them to accompany the Bible with a commentary.

This danger (let it be remembered) is real, only with respect to modern translations, and to the revisions of the received versions. An ancient translation has stood the test of time, of the best judges, and of the public conscience. The maximum of its errors is known. There are no longer, (thanks to Christianity and its reformation in the sixteenth century.) either secret doctrines, or exclusive possession of the means of instruction or oversight, nor any want of bold and fearless critics, or jealous centinels either among the disinterested friends of virtue, or on the part of their religious and political opposition.

We see what a series of important questions arise in the minds of those who would thoroughly examine this subject which I have proposed to the friends of the Bible cause. I am able only to touch upon it to-day.

The single object I have in view at the present moment is, to lessen, if possible, the regret of those who wish for a radical revision, a reform, or a total re-modelling of the received versions.\* Afflicted at seeing such imperfect translations still in the hands of the people, they complain that their wish is retarded or rather indefinitely postponed, by the kind of renewed sanction, which the Bible Societies, from wise and powerful motives, have been compelled to give to the old translations.—I shall endeavour to diminish the chagrin with which they view this subject.

\* \* \* \* \*

I shall not speak therefore of the beneficial effects which have resulted from the restriction imposed on the Bible Societies, by

\* Observe in what terms Messrs. Schulthess and Gaspard, two distinguished theologians and celebrated professors at Zurich, have lately expressed themselves on this subject, in a German publication entitled, *Rationalism and Supranaturalism*. (Zurich, 1822. 8vo.) "The best founded objection we have heard made to the Bible Society, is, that by its operations it raises an insurmountable obstacle in the way of making and introducing into the churches a translation, which shall correspond to the progress and present condition of knowledge." See also on this subject the remarks of Abauzit. *Expedience of publishing improved versions of the Bible*. London. 1817.

their wise regulation, nor of the great inconveniences which would soon more than balance the advantages promised by the scheme of dividing their labours between the distribution of Bibles which have been longest in use, and the improvement of those most in circulation.

For the present it will suffice to point out in a few words one of these inconveniences. If Bible Societies should encourage the publication of new versions of the Bible, designed for the use of Christians who are already in possession of those most approved, or if they should distribute the old translations altered by the advice and co-operation of these Societies; they might be suspected, and with some appearance of reason, of sectarian proselytism, and the reproach recently cast upon them would appear well founded. Above all, (and this mistake would affect them more sensibly than any other) they would be exposed to see one of the most enlarged and generous views entertained by their founders, the success of which would be the most delightful reward of their labours, entirely overlooked or misconstrued; I mean that truly evangelical design of forming around the Sacred Volume, the august, the affecting, the holy alliance of all Christians—who under all the various denominations, leaders, different forms of worship, adore the same God, the same Saviour. But abjuring all other thoughts, every wish but that of imparting to all men without regard to difference of belief, the influence of divine grace, through the medium of the Holy Scriptures, they have made an engagement, and let them scrupulously fulfil it, to offer to the faithful of every Christian communion only such translations as have long received the sanction of their spiritual guides. Thus the reproach of proselytism falls on the word of God itself, which is powerful enough to defend itself against its adversaries, who would set its noble promoters on a level with the most despicable enemies of political and moral order.\*

\* See a pamphlet entitled, *Reflexions prejudiciables sur la petition du sieur Love-day*, par M. de Bonald. Paris 1822. p. 9, 10. "There certainly never was a more zealous spirit of proselyting than that of the philosophers of the last century, who following Voltaire, sold irreligious books at 6 sous for those of the lower classes. What have revolutionists in every age done, and what will they not always do, for the promotion of their opinions? They have left no means untried, from the guillotine to penny ballads. The great bible enterprize which fills the world is only a most extensive display of this proselyting spirit—if indeed it be not rather a cunning commercial speculation."



**MISCELLANEOUS COLLECTIONS.**

---

**LIFE OF BISHOP ANDREWS.**

**L**ANCELOT ANDREWS was born in the city of London in 1555, under the reign of queen Mary. His parents were honest and religious; his father born of an ancient family in Suffolk, after passing most of his life at sea, had attained the creditable and comfortable situation of master of the Trinity house. From his childhood Lancelot displayed an uncommon love of learning and a natural seriousness which rendered him indifferent to the usual diversions and exercises of his age. His proficiency in his Greek and Hebrew studies at Merchant-taylors' school recommended him to the notice of Dr. Watts, residentiary of St. Paul's, who bestowed on him one of the scholarships which he had recently founded at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. After taking his degree of bachelor of arts, a fellowship was speedily, and with much honour, conferred upon him; and commencing his studies in divinity, his great abilities and unwearied application ensured his proficiency in that branch of science. He was chosen catechist in his college, and after a time, his fame spreading, he became known as a great adept in cases of conscience, and was much resorted to in that capacity. Henry earl of Huntingdon, a noted patron of the stricter class of divines, now engaged him to attend him into the north, where he was lord-president, and in this situation Andrews had the satisfaction of converting several recusants, priests as well as laymen. Secretary Walsingham next took notice of his merit, presented him to the living of Cripplegate, and afterwards added other preferments.

His next step was that of chaplain in ordinary to queen Elizabeth, who, much approving his preaching, his grave deportment and his single life, made him first prebendary, and shortly before her death dean, of Westminster. In this situation, which imposed upon him the superintendence of Westminster school, his conduct was a model certainly unsurpassed, and probably unequalled, by any of his successors. Dr. Hacket informs us, that when Williams was preferred to the same office, having heard what pains Dr. Andrews had taken to train up the youth on that foundation, he sent for himself from Cambridge to give him fuller information; and he thus details the merits of the friend and instructor of his youth in language warm with gratitude:

'I told him how strict that excellent man was, to charge our masters that they should give us lessons out of none but the most

classical authors; that he did often supply the place both of head schoolmaster and usher for the space of an whole week together, and gave us not an hour of loitering-time from morning to night. How he caused our exercises in prose and verse to be brought to him to examine our style and proficiency. That he never walked to Chiswick for his recreation without a brace of this young fry; and in that wayfaring leisure had a singular dexterity to fill those narrow vessels with a funnel. And, which was the greatest burden of his toil, sometimes thrice in a week, sometimes oftener, he sent for the uppermost scholars to his lodgings at night, and kept them with him from eight till eleven, unfolding to them the best rudiments of the Greek tongue and the elements of the Hebrew grammar; and all this he did to boys without any compulsion of correction; nay, I never heard him utter so much as a word of austerity among us.

‘Alas! this is but an ivy leaf crept into the laurel of his immortal garland. This is that Andrews the ointment of whose name is sweeter than spices. This is that celebrated bishop of Winton, whose learning king James admired above all his chaplains; and that king, being of most excellent parts himself, could the better discover what was eminent in another. Indeed he was the most apostolical and primitive like divine, in my opinion, that wore a rochet in his age; of a most venerable gravity, and yet most sweet in all commerce; the most devout that ever I saw when he appeared before God; of such a growth in all kind of learning, that very able clerks were of low stature to him: . . . . . full of alms and charity; of which none knew but his father in secret: a certain patron to scholars of fame and ability, and chiefly to those that never expected it. In the pulpit, a Homer among preachers. . . . . I am transported even as in a rapture to make this digression: For who could come near the shrine of such a saint, and not offer up a few grains of glory upon it? Or how durst I omit it? For he was the first that planted me in my tender studies, and watered them continually with his bounty.’\*

In reference to the walks of this good dean to Chiswick with the schoolboys for his companions, so affectionately commemorated by Hacket, it may be mentioned from another source, that from his youth upwards, his favourite, if not his only relaxation, had been walking, either by himself or with some chosen companions; ‘with whom he might confer and argue and recount their studies: and he would often profess, that to observe the grass, herbs, corn, trees, cattle, earth, waters, heavens, any of

\* *Life of Williams.*



the creatures, and to contemplate their natures, orders, qualities, virtues, uses, was ever to him the greatest mirth, content and recreation that could be: and this he held to his dying day.\*

Doubtless, with so constant a love of the appearances of external nature acting upon his pious and contemplative mind, this excellent instructor embraced these opportunities of teaching his young disciples to look up through the medium of a beautiful creation to its benignant author;—and happy those who are *thus* instructed to know and love their maker.

All who have made mention of this exemplary prelate agree in revering him for the virtues peculiarly fitted to his station. He was humane, hospitable, charitable to the poor, of unfailing bounty and kindness to the deserving, especially to poor scholars and divines, and munificent in his donations to learned and charitable foundations. But he had still rarer and perhaps higher merits. He was disinterested, inflexible in principle, and courageously independent. The extensive patronage which he possessed appears to have been in his hand an instrument devoutly consecrated to the advancement of religion, learning and good morals. To all the promptings of self-interest, to all solicitations of men in power, he resolutely turned a deaf ear when they interfered with higher motives. It is said by his biographer, that the sins which he abhorred most were simony and sacrilege. The first of these † was so detestable to him as that for refusing to admit divers men to livings whom he suspected to be simonically preferred, he suffered much by suits of law: choosing rather to be compelled against his will to admit them by law, than voluntarily to do that which his conscience made scruple of.† We are further told that his dread of committing sacrilege, caused him in the time of Elizabeth to refuse successively the bishoprics of Salisbury and Ely when offered to him under the usual conditions of that time,—the alienation of church-lands in favour of laymen and courtiers. He is also said, when bishop of Winchester, to have refused several large sums of money for renewals of leases which he conceived injurious to his successors.

It should appear however, that in these sacrifices of worldly interest, Andrews was rather influenced by a nice sense of professional integrity and worldly honour than by any superstitious opinions respecting the sacredness of church property; for Selden has mentioned him as the only bishop who thought proper to express an approbation of his ‘History of tythes,’ so much the object of alarm or horror to the clerical body at large.

The accession of James facilitated the advancement of An-

\* Fuller’s *Abel redivivus*, article *Andrews*.

† Fuller, *ut supra*.

draws by putting an end to that system of spoliation to which he was resolved not to become instrumental. Struck with his style of preaching, and filled with admiration at the extent and solidity of his erudition, the king spontaneously nominated him to the see of Chichester, adding a good living in *commendam*, and ordered him to write in favour of the oath of allegiance. In process of time his majesty appointed him lord almoner, translated him first to Ely, and finally to Winchester, and made him dean of the chapel royal and a privy-councillor. But even this extraordinary accumulation of benefits, acting on a mind peculiarly susceptible of the sentiments of gratitude, was unable to abase the spirit of Andrews to that servile adulation which the monarch loved, and which other dignitaries of the church paid him without scruple, though at the expense of truth, of patriotism, and sometimes even of piety.

To this effect a striking anecdote has been preserved by Waller the poet. On the day when James had dissolved in anger the parliament which assembled in January 1621, on account of its refusal of further supplies, Waller went to court and saw the king dine in public. Bishop Andrews, and Neil then bishop of Ely, stood behind his chair: the monarch turned to them, and, with his usual indiscretion, asked them aloud, if he might not levy money upon his subjects when he wanted it, without applying to parliament. Neil, one of the most shameless of his flatterers, replied without hesitation, 'God forbid you might not! for you are the breath of our nostrils.' 'Well, my lord,' said the king to Andrews, 'and what say you?' 'Sir,' replied the bishop, 'I am not skilled in parliamentary cases.' 'No put-offs, my lord,' insisted the king, 'answer me presently.' 'I think, then,' replied the bishop, 'that it is lawful for you to take my brother Neil's money, for he offers it.' Nothing but the wit of the answer could have atoned for its courage.

Bishop Andrews was one of the few clerical members of the society of antiquaries: Bacon appears to have held him in high esteem, and addressed to him his 'Dialogue on a holy war,' with an interesting epistle dedicatory, in which he enters at large into his own manner of life, and details the philosophical reflections and pursuits which consoled him under adversity and disgrace. The bishop ended his honourable and exemplary career in September 1626, in his 71st year. His death was bewailed, amongst the national calamities of the time, in an animated Latin elegy from the pen of a youth, whose noble mind, penetrated with that affectionate veneration for the wise and good which affords the best presage of future excellence, delighted thus to pay its pure and unbidden homage to the reverend sanc-



tity of the aged prelate. This youth was Milton, then in his eighteenth year. The concluding lines, in which he represents himself as transported in a vision to the gardens of the blessed, have been thus beautifully rendered into English by the poet of the 'Task :'

... "While I that splendour, and the mingled shade  
Of fruitful vines, and wonder fixt survey'd,  
At once, with looks that beamed celestial grace,  
The seer of Winton stood before my face.  
His snowy vesture's hem descending low  
His golden sandals swept, and pure as snow  
New-fallen shone the mitre on his brow.  
Where'er he trod, a tremulous sweet sound  
Of gladness shook the flowery fields around :  
Attendant angels clap their starry wings,  
The trumpet shakes the sky, all æther sings,  
Each chaunts his welcome, folds him to his breast,  
And thus a sweeter voice than all the rest :  
'Ascend, my son ! thy father's kingdom share !  
My son ! henceforth be freed from every care !'  
So spake the voice, and at its tender close  
With psaltry's sound th' angelic band arose.  
The night retir'd, and chased by dawning day  
The visionary bliss pass'd all away.  
I mourn'd my banish'd sleep with fond concern ;  
Frequent to me may dreams like these return."

*Miss Aikin's King James.*

---

THE SENSE OF OUR RELATION TO GOD.

DR. PRICE in his book on morals, in remarking on the superior importance of the duty we owe to God, and of the place it holds among our other duties, has the following admirable passage.

'There can certainly be no proportion between what is due from us to creatures and to the Creator ; between the regard and deference we owe to beings of precarious, derived, and limited goodness, and to him, who possesses original, necessary, everlasting, infinite fullness of all that is amiable. As much as this being surpasses other beings in perfection and excellence, so much is he, the worthier object of our veneration and love. The whole universe, compared with God, is nothing in itself, nothing to us. He ought then to be *all* to us ; his will our unalterable guide ; his goodness the object of our constant praise and trust : the consideration of his all-directing Providence our highest joy ; the securing his favour our utmost ambition ; and the imitation of his righteousness, the great end and aim of all

our actions. He is the fountain of all power and jurisdiction; the cause of all causes, the disposer of the lots and circumstances of all beings, the life and informing principle of all nature; from whose never-ceasing influence every thing derives its capacity of giving us pleasure; and in whom, as their source and centre, are united all the degrees of beauty and good we can observe in the creation. On Him then ought our strongest affection and admiration to be fixed, and to him ought our minds to be continually directed. It is here undoubtedly virtue ought to begin. From hence it should take its rise. A regard to God, as our first and sovereign principle, should always possess us, accompany us in the discharge of all private and social duties, and govern our whole life. Inferior authority we ought to submit to; but with reference to that authority, which is the ground of all other, and supreme in nature. Inferior benefactors we should be grateful to in proportion to our obligations to them, but yet, considering them as only instruments of his goodness, and reserving our first and chief gratitude to our first and chief benefactor. The gifts of his bounty, the objects to which he has adapted our faculties, and the means of happiness, he has provided for us, we should accept and enjoy; but it would be disingenuous and base to do it, with little consideration of the giver, or with hearts void of emotion towards him. Created excellence and beauty we may and must admire; but it would be inexcusable to be so much engrossed with these, as to overlook him, who is the root of every thing good and lovely, and before whom all other excellence vanishes. To him through all inferior causes we ought to look; and his hand it becomes us to own and adore in all the phenomena of nature, and in every event. The consideration of his presence with us should affect us more, and be an unspeakably stronger guard and check upon our behaviour, than if we knew we were every moment exposed to the view of the whole creation. We ought to love him above all things, to throw open our minds, as much as possible, to his influence, and keep up a constant intercourse with him by prayer and unaffected devotion. We ought to refer ourselves absolutely to his management, rely implicitly on his care, commit with boundless hope our whole beings to him in well doing, and wish for nothing, at any time, but what is most acceptable to his wisdom and goodness. In short, he ought to have in all respects the supremacy in our minds; every action and design should be secured to him; reverence, admiration, hope, joy, desire of approbation and all the affections suited to such an object should discover and exert themselves within us in the highest degree we are capable of them. An union to him by a resemblance and



participation of his perfections we should aspire to as our complete dignity and happiness, beyond which there can be nothing worthy the concern of any being. No rebellious inclination should be once indulged; no murmur, in any event, show itself in our minds; and no desire or thought ever entertained by us, which is inconsistent with cheerful allegiance, a zealous attachment, and an inviolable loyalty of heart to his government.'—  
*Price on Morals.*

---

THE WIDOW OF NAIN.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN DISCIPLE.

Oh mingle with the widow's tears,  
The drops for misery shed,  
She bends beneath the weight of years,  
Her earthly hope has fled!

Her son, her only son has gone—  
O who shall wipe that eye,—  
For she must journey lonely on,  
And solitary die!

The pall upon his corse is spread,  
The bier they slowly raise;—  
It cannot rouse the slumb'ring dead,  
That widow'd mother's gaze.

She follows on without a tear  
Her dear, her darling child—  
But who is he who stops the bier  
With look and accent mild?

The Saviour is that pitying one,  
His glance her woe disarms—  
'Young man, arise!'—a living son  
Is in his mother's arms!

## TO THE CONDUCTORS OF THE CHRISTIAN DISCIPLE.

GENTLEMEN,—I send you two or three hymns. If you think them entitled to a place in the Disciple, you will insert one or more of them, in a number, as you see fit.

Yours, with respect, &c.

A HYMN.—*St. Thomas.*

## FOR A BIRTH-DAY.

1. ALL hail the smiling rays  
Of this my natal day !  
Awake, my soul, to sound his praise,  
Who formed this living clay.
2. How many tranquil years  
I've pass'd beneath thy care !  
His love has oft assuaged my fears,  
And answered every prayer.
3. My soul, with humble joy  
Review the season past ;  
Let thankful songs my lips employ,  
While life and being last.
4. My father's God, on thee  
My only hopes depend ;  
From every sin preserve me free,  
From every ill defend.
5. With thee I leave my cares,  
To thee my soul entrust,  
To thee devote my future years,  
Till nature sleep in dust.

W.



## REVIEW.

### ARTICLE XVI.

*The Remains of Henry Kirke White, of Nottingham, late of St. John's College, Cambridge; with an account of his life.* By ROBERT SOUTHEY. Vol. III. London, 1822. pp. 185, 8vo.

WE will own to a feeling of regret on hearing that a new volume was added to the 'Remains of Henry Kirke White.' We could not help thinking it would make less valuable what had been published already, and be an injury instead of a fresh ornament to his memory. It seemed a hazardous experiment to try to refresh after the lapse of so many years the interest which was excited at first in the fate, character and productions of a young man, distinguished but for his high early promise. That kind of interest glows but once in the public mind, when there is something of curiosity and novelty in it, and events are recent. It then gives place, and the partiality of friendship and the fondness of family attachment must not be offended or surprised when it does so. When Mr. Spencer of Liverpool was drowned at the age of twenty years,—a year younger than White, and quite as remarkable as he,—the public received very thankfully a small volume commemorative of one who possessed such rare qualities and was so deeply lamented. This was what it ought to have been: but how mistaken would be the zeal, which should now try to retouch those impressions of sympathy and admiration, by sending out another volume collected from his papers and correspondence! It is not often that the letters and small writings even of mature and eminent men have any permanent value, or are long read; and what can be expected from the multiplying of such from the pen of a mere youth?—There seemed too a sort of injustice and indelicacy in being very officious with the juvenile compositions, which by this time, had he lived, he might have wished to destroy out of his own sight;—and in persevering to make the world acquainted with the crude thoughts and unreserved communications, which he would himself probably have forgotten. Nothing, we reasoned, requires a more cautious discrimination than the selecting for publication from the papers of the dead, who prepared nothing with reference to such a design: but what application can possibly have been made of this excellent principle in the volume, with which we are now threatened? We thought,

beside, of the art of book-making ; and apprehended another specimen of this most common kind of offence,—perpetrated too under the name of one who is not here to answer for himself, or to cry ‘hold.’ In addition to all this, we acknowledge plainly the opinion, that the two octavo volumes already printed were extracts sufficiently copious,—if not, much more than were good,—from the manuscripts of a student of twenty-one, who had not yet completed his preparation for the active services of life. From such remains all are ready to be pleased with a few selections ; and if these are well made they are valuable in proportion as they are few : but who would have them grow into a library ? Mr. Southey is wrong, we were ready to say. Every one must respect his pure attachment to virtues like White’s, and to talents consecrated as his were. But it was time to leave them with Him, before whom alone they shall be held in perpetual remembrance.

With these feelings we took up the present volume, expecting to be wearied and displeased with it. And we wish we could add that the expectation was disappointed.—It is possible that the opportunity of its frontispiece might have contributed a little to the compilation. This is an engraving of the tablet, which was sculptured by Chantrey at the request and expense of our townsman Francis Boott, Esq., and erected in All Saints Church, Cambridge. It bears the following inscription, written by William Smyth Esq. Professor of Modern History :

HENRY KIRKE WHITE.

*Born March 21st, 1785. Died October 18th, 1806.*

Warm with fond hope and learning’s sacred flame,  
To Granta’s bowers the youthful poet came.  
Unconquered powers th’ immortal mind displayed,  
But worn with anxious thought the frame decayed.  
Pale o’er his lamp and in his cell retired,  
The martyr student faded and expired.  
O genius, taste and piety sincere,  
Too early lost ’midst duties too severe !  
Foremost to mourn was generous Southey seen,  
He told the tale and showed what White had been ;  
Nor told in vain.—Far o’er the Atlantic wave  
A wanderer came, and sought the poet’s grave :  
On yon low stone he sought his lonely name,  
And raised this fond memorial to his fame.

The preface contains rather a common place account of the manner in which Henry came to think very seriously on religion. It seems that a Mr. Almond, now rector of St. Peters, Nottingham, who was his school-fellow and one of his most intimate friends, having heard him speak of the book of Isaiah as an epic, and that of Job as a dramatic poem, suddenly broke off his acquaintance without assigning any reason, and carefully shunned him : which certainly was not very generous. When at last Henry called on



him for an explanation, he entered on a long discourse, and concluded by putting into his hands Scott's 'Force of truth : '—which certainly was very silly. Henry had, however, too much good sense to be affected by so weak an instrument, and returned the book 'with disapprobation.' He was now about eighteen ; and at this period of his life he became strongly interested in the subject of religion, to which he had probably never been wholly indifferent, and resolved to devote himself to its teaching and service. The truth is, (according to Mr. Southey's own words) he was now old enough to feel that 'there is no happiness, no rest without religion ;' and when his attention was once fairly engaged in it, he gave himself up to its first influences with the impetuosity and deep sensibility which belonged to his character. This is the amount of his conversion ; to the honour of being an instrument in which Mr. Almond and some one else, who was his tutor for a few weeks, have put in rival pretensions.

After the preface we have a few letters, or fragments of letters, of which it is not enough to say that they are altogether ordinary. There is a spirit about them that we do not like, and a certain tone of 'the elect ;' which, however, we do not consider so much his own as a part of the religious manner and language of his sect. Neither did it promise well, his proposing on his outset in the study of the scriptures to show how exactly they correspond with the articles of the church of England ; nor his summing up the 'extraneous learning' necessary for a clergyman in 'knowing the Latin tolerably,' and being able to read his Greek Testament. Complacency with his own attainments and prospects is brought continually, though he was probably unconscious of it, into view ; and he writes to his older brother quite as if he were John the Presbyter. He speaks with all dread of 'the pride of learning, and the pride of reason,' of being 'deluded by proud logic and proud inquiries ;' and lays down as a sufficient and indispensable foundation such explanations as these : 'We are all sinners even from the womb ; we are intent ever on sinful objects, and every thought of our heart is evil. In this state, we are justly liable to God's wrath and everlasting damnation, and in this state must every man naturally be, since we are born under the curse, and so destitute of good that we cannot of ourselves forsake sin or pursue virtue. But God, of his great mercy, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, has offered redemption to mankind, and has promised to afford them *the capacity* of following the good and eschewing the evil, on the simple condition of faith in his Almighty Son. We may be abandoned we may be depraved and

unprincipled, but God will still adhere to the letter of his promises; and when we turn to him, acknowledge our unworthiness, and oppressed with the sense of our deplorable corruptions cry out for salvation by the blood of the Redeemer alone, He will then unquestionably hear us.' pp. 26, 27. 'We see God visiting the earth, promulging doctrines which the world had never any idea of before; laying the foundation, in a few ignorant fishermen, of a religion which was to spread over the whole civilized world; and finally sealing his testament with *his blood*, and ransoming by that sacrifice the fallen race of man from the curse due to his disobedience.' p. 29. In truth these letters show neither knowledge nor acuteness of any kind, and his amiable mind seems to be overshadowed by the superstitious and dark system of faith, under which his strong feelings without examination drove and subjected him.—Let us not be understood as speaking reproachfully of him by pointing out these faults. They were the faults of a young man, and he would have outlearned and outlived them. But we do protest against publishing thus to the world the weaknesses of piety and genius, under the appearance of doing them honour.

'Early Poems,' and 'Poems of later date,' follow the Letters, and are of little interest; except two of the Hymns: of one of which these are the three first verses:

'The Lord our God is full of might,  
The winds obey his will:  
He speaks, and in his heavenly height  
The rolling sun stands still.

Rebel, ye waves, and o'er the land  
With threatening aspect roar!  
The Lord uplifts his awful hand,  
And chains you to the shore.

Howl, winds of night, your force combine!  
Without his high behest,  
Ye shall not in the mountain pine  
Disturb the sparrow's nest.'

The hymn is found entire in the New York Collection. There are two amatory songs among these effusions, which every motive should have excluded from the collection; and which could scarcely have obtained admission if the editor had not determined to insert every thing he could find. Not that there is any very great harm in them, but they are utterly out of tune with all our recollections of the author; and besides, we do not know how to forgive them, they are so extremely poor. It would be unjust to think the worse of the youth for writing them:—both Grotius and Beza wrote much more exceptionable things in good classical Latin without scandal:—but there is a



righteous displeasure due to the editor, whose own poetry is chaste as the marbles of the statuary, and free—almost beyond parallel—from all but poetical licentiousness.

The last part of the volume consists of prose compositions. These are mere miscellaneous fragments on the most common themes, not superior in point of thought and manner to the productions of most young men of his standing in our own schools. Chief of them are the beginnings of essays, broken off just when something is intended to be reasoned on or proved. Whether they were never finished, or whether the editor considered the rest as best omitted, we are nowhere told. The former supposition is the more probable. But however the case may be, we must acknowledge a feeling of disappointment in finding ourselves thus suddenly left at the very opening of a subject, and sometimes before getting any clear apprehension of what the subject is meant to be. There can be no use in such dismembered or rather unformed limbs of compositions. They have neither expression nor life, and look as they occupy their little room on the well-starred page like relics, treasured up for some heavenly but entirely hidden virtues. Several of the pieces however are less imperfect, and afford specimens of the writer's way of thinking. In the last fragment he boldly contends, against all 'vain philosophy,' that the heathen gods were manifestly the very devils themselves, who governed the greater part of the ancient world, assisted miracle-mongers, and inspired oracles. 'The course of all history,' he says, 'sacred and profane, countenances the idea; and after the body of evidence afforded by the ancient writers on this point, to express unqualified and unhesitating disbelief can only argue an utter ignorance of the grounds, on which we can alone judge in this mysterious subject.'

There is a letter addressed to the editor of some public journal 'on the nicknames of controversial disputants,' from which we are disposed to give an extract, though the letter as a whole is written with no great clearness or closeness of thinking. 'I have observed among some persons an attachment to names in the church of Christ, which bodes no good to its interests. I begin to fear lest religion should be brought to consist in names alone, and lest the too frequent use of doctrinal terms should degenerate into a mere repetition of words without meaning or effect. From the answers to correspondents in your last number, I find a writer, whose signature is Theodosius, disapproves of the biographical sketches, which have recently appeared in your work, as *unevangelical*. Permit me to remark, Mr. Editor, that every thing which tends to the establishment of virtue and

morality, and whatever discountenances vice upon proper grounds, is evangelical. You yourself allow, in your notice of this correspondent, that 'in some of the sketches less is said than might have been wished, respecting some very essential doctrines of christianity.' I need scarcely remark that christianity does not consist in doctrines; or that a man may be a very good Christian, who has very little notion of these doctrines as a system or plan of human salvation. There are, I believe, many now living, and in former times for obvious reasons there have been many more, who have \* \* \* walked in humble confidence with the Lord their God all the days of their lives, without ever hearing the word *evangelical*, or of any compendious arrangement of the gospel system, such as, in these times, is considered as the *shibboleth* of the faithful. The doctrinal part of the gospel is much too exclusively insisted upon by zealous ministers and zealous writers.—This is very well said, and indicates a spirit that would not always we think have remained subjugated to the religious theories, to which the understanding at first submitted. The following reason is assigned among others, for saying less about peculiar doctrines: 'the great features of the system of salvation contained in the New Testament, by being less argued, will in process of time come to be less disputed.' By these 'great features' are meant doubtless the Medusa lineaments which have been already held up to our readers; and the reasoning reminds us of a very opposite view of the subject taken by an orthodox writer of our own. It was in the Panoplist, we think, that bitter complaints were once made against the sin of omitting to insist continually on these 'doctrines of grace:' for, it was argued, if the people were once suffered to lose their familiarity with them, and let them be long out of sight, they would be actually too much shocked on their re-appearance to be willing ever to receive them again. Which of these conclusions was the more natural? The young poet's has the better sound; but then our friend at Andover had further experience, and more years over his head.

In speaking thus of the third volume of the '*Remains of Henry Kirke White*,' let us be allowed to repeat that we would derogate nothing from the pure fame of his genius and worth. We pay homage to it all. There is certainly no object so interesting, except the rewards of an honoured age, as the opening promise of so gifted and lovely a youth as his. To make no great account of his knowledge or opinions is to rob him of nothing of his praise. His Muse was worth more than many men's researches; and his excellent and devout heart was better than all the tenets in philosophy or divinity either, which men can dispute.



ARTICLE XVII.

*The Life of the Rev. Thomas Scott, D.D. Rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks ; including a narrative drawn up by himself, and copious extracts of his letters.* By John Scott, A.M. Vicar of North Ferriby, and Minister of St. Mary's, Hull. Boston. S. T. Armstrong & Crocker & Brewster. 12mo. pp. 454.

THIS is a large volume, but probably none too large for the admirers of Dr. Scott. It is in many cases not so much the merit of the individual, as the number and character of his friends and adherents, which determines the measure of his written biography. However numerous and valuable a man's public labors may have been, and however great the benefits derived to the church by his writings,—it is not the account of these which swells the history of his life ; for they are necessarily told in short compass : but it is extracts from his diaries and letters, reports of his conversation and his feelings, and panegyrics on his character. Many men of far higher eminence than Scott have passed away with far scantier biography, for there was no inroad made into their privacies of life, or character, or devotion, and nothing told about them but what was in its nature public, and might be regarded as belonging to the public. But there is a portion of the religious community in which there is an insatiable curiosity to know the secrets of other men's religion, to see the workings of their souls, the times and length of their private prayers, the manner of their conversation, their expressions and feelings in sickness and in death, and to gratify this curiosity, the friends keep letters, and take minutes of conversation, and treasure up strong expressions of faith, and hand them over to some common friend, a son perhaps, who collects them all together, and being in a manner compelled to take something from every contributor, hence comes forth a large book, like the one before us—proportioned to the feelings of the friends rather than to the claims of the man.

The reputation of Scott, and the number of his writings, which have kept him constantly before the public for many years, together with the story of his conversion and the pains taken to praise him and circulate his works, have excited an interest in his history and character which justifies his son in the publication of this voluminous life. He has adapted it to

the tastes and wants of those for whom it is designed. He has taken care in every possible way to gratify every possible curiosity concerning his father, and to feed to the full the love of talking and hearing of every circle of religious gossip. He has been anxious to leave nothing untold, of however private and delicate a nature, and in doing this has sometimes, we should think, rather promoted the cause of petty scandal than of religious edification.

We do not intend, however, to criticise the book severely. Different men have different tastes; and the taste of the *evangelicals*, for whom our biographer writes, is such as to impose upon him an unfortunate task, which he has executed, we should imagine, to their entire satisfaction. With that taste, we have no concern. The book was not made for us, and we have no right to complain. Apart from this at which we have hinted, there is much in the book which is exceeding good and highly entertaining. There is more to be told about Scott than about most men, much of which is well worth reading, and not a little instructive. We take the opportunity therefore of this publication to devote a few pages to this conspicuous person, who has been so long proclaimed to the world as one of the great and wonderful lights of the church, and cited as an almost miraculous and quite an infallible testimony to the truth of Calvinism.

The present volume is composed of a sketch written by Dr. Scott himself,\* filled up, and carried down to the time of his death by his son. He was born in February, 1747. His father, who was a grazier in Lincolnshire, designed him for the medical profession, and sent him to a distant school at the age of ten years, where he remained during five years without visiting home. He was then bound to a surgeon and apothecary at Alford, about eight miles from his father's residence. Here his conduct was so bad, that in two months he was dismissed in disgrace, and incurred the severe and lasting displeasure of his father. His master would not surrender his indentures, so that he remained nominally his apprentice, and was thus excluded from the profession for which he had been designed. This seems to have been the first in that train of circumstances

\* 'The first sentence of this manuscript will explain, at once, his reason for so doing, and the nature of the composition. "As there can be little doubt," he says, "that, after my decease, something in the way of memoir or narrative, will be published concerning me; to prevent misinformation, and to supply a few authentic materials, I purpose, in the following sheets, to state such facts as seem of sufficient importance, leaving it, in general, to others to make their observations upon them."'



which led to and determined his condition and labours in after life. His father from this time treated him with unremitted harshness and severity, as if to revenge himself on the son for the disgrace he had brought upon the family by his misconduct.

‘Immediately on my return home, I was set to do, as well as I could, the most laborious and dirty parts of the work belonging to a grazier. On this I entered at the beginning of winter: and, as much of my father’s farm consisted of low land, which was often flooded, I was introduced to scenes of hardship, and exposed to many dangers from wet and cold, for which my previous habits had not prepared me. In consequence I was frequently ill, and at length suffered such repeated and obstinate maladies, (especially the ague, and effects following from it,) that my life was more than once despaired of. Yet a kind of indignant, proud self-revenge kept me from complaining of hardship; though of reproach, and even of reproof, I was impatient to the greatest degree of irascibility.

‘The discontent which corroded my mind during several of these years, surpasses description; and it soured my temper beyond its natural harshness: thus rendering me a great temptation, as well as trial, to my father, and those around me; to whom I generally behaved very disrespectfully, not to say, insolently. After some time, however, I became rather more reconciled to my lot; and concluded, that, though, for my misconduct at Alford, I was treated more harshly than others of the family, I should at length be provided for as a grazier: and, in consequence, waking dreams of other pursuits seemed to be less vivid in my mind.’

His ‘other pursuits’ were connected with ambitious plans of rising in the world, with which view he spent much time in reading such books as he could procure, while at other times he relieved the tediousness of his life by frequenting low and irreligious company, and engaging in scenes of ‘low-lived riot.’ He discovered at length that his exasperated parent would make but a wretched provision for him by his will, and this roused him to exertion.

‘On this discovery, I determined to make some effort, however desperate, to extricate myself: and I only waited for an opportunity to declare my determination. Without delay, my Greek grammar was studied through and through; and I made what use I could of my Latin books: my father, in the mean time, expressing his astonishment at my conduct.

‘At length, in April, 1772, [æ. 25.] I avowed my intention, in almost the worst manner possible. After a long wet day, of incessant fatigue, I deemed myself, and perhaps with justice, to be causelessly and severely blamed, and I gave full vent to my indignant passions; and, throwing aside my shepherd’s frock, declared

my purpose no more to resume it. That night I lodged at my brother's, at a little distance: but, in the morning, I considered that a large flock of ewes, in yeaning time had no one to look after them, who was competent to the task. I therefore returned, and did what was needful; and then set off for Boston, where a clergyman resided, with whom I had contracted some acquaintance, by conversing with him on common matters, when he came to do duty in my brother's village, and took refreshment at his house.

'To this clergyman I opened my mind with hesitation and trepidation: and nothing could well exceed his astonishment when he heard my purpose of attempting to obtain orders. He knew me only as a shepherd, somewhat more conversible, perhaps, than others in that station, and immediately asked, "Do you know any thing of Latin and Greek?" I told him, I had received an education, but that for almost ten years I had never seen a Greek book, except the grammar. He instantly took down a Greek Testament, and put it into my hands; and without difficulty I read several verses, giving both the Latin and English rendering of them, according to the custom of our school. On this, having strongly expressed his surprise, he said, "Our visitation will be next week; the archdeacon, Dr. Gordon, will be here; and, if you will be in the town, I will mention you to him, and induce him if I can, to send for you." This being settled, I returned immediately to my father for the intervening days; knowing how much, at that season, he wanted my help, for services which he could no longer perform himself, and was not accustomed to entrust to servants.'

We cannot follow the narrative through the detail of the perplexities and embarrassments in which he was now entangled, his perseverance amidst which, discouraged and baffled as he was, discovers that energy and decision of character,\* which distinguished him through life, and laid the foundation of his eminence. We can only record, that the pride of his family was at length engaged in assisting him, his father, gave the required consent, he went to Boston to pursue his studies, passed an examination for Deacon's orders with good reputation, was admitted to ordination September 20, 1772, and immediately became curate at Stoke Goldington.

The whole of this transaction, while it evinces the strength and perseverance of his character, exhibits him most disadvantageously in a moral and religious point of view. It is not strange that in speaking of it afterward he should have pronounced it, 'the most atrocious wickedness of his life.' For he

\* The manner in which he finished his first unsuccessful application for orders in London affords an amusing specimen. 'At length I reached Braytoft [the village where his father lived] after walking twenty miles in the forenoon, and, having dined, I put off my clerical clothes, resumed my Shepherd's dress, and sheared eleven large sheep in the afternoon.'



was evidently influenced by no religious motive and sought no religious end. He was very far from having any serious impressions of religion, or any sense of the importance and responsibility of the office he had undertaken. He was in truth an irreligious man, who had entered the christian ministry exclusively from selfish and ambitious motives and for worldly ends. This will be made more manifest as we proceed. In his new situation he devoted himself ardently to study, of which he was extravagantly fond, and pursued eagerly the path of distinction and honour. He went over a large range of study, with keen relish, instigated by the hope of future preferment. For the same reasons he was laborious in his preparation for preaching. 'Diligence seems to have been a sort of elementary ingredient in his character.' After a little more than two years thus spent, diligently as a scholar, unfaithfully as a minister, he was married to a lady whom he 'first met with at a christening, and won her money at cards.' He tells us, also in this connexion, 'when with a female servant we entered on a temporary dwelling of our own, I immediately began family worship; though I had never lived in any family where it was practised, nor ever been present at such a service, except once, which was in the house of a dissenting minister.' Yet he had been ordained more than two years.

Shortly after this marriage he removed to the curacy of Ravenstone, the next village. It was here that he began to be roused from his deplorable state of impiety and irreligion, and that the change took place in his opinions and character, which has been so noised abroad in the world. From a vain, ambitious, hypocritical, worldly man, wearing the cloak of religion as a means of temporal advancement, professing a doctrine of which he knew nothing, while secretly he held a doctrine of which he knew as little, a man of study and speculation, but of neither faith nor piety; he came gradually under the power of religious principle, and grew up to a devout and exemplary Christian. We have no belief that the peculiarities of faith in which he settled are the peculiarities of christianity; but there is no doubt that he became a religious man, which he plainly was not before. It was the want of religious sentiment, not of right religious speculation, which had been his ruin; and it was the acquiring religious sentiment, and not a new opinion on speculative points, which saved him. Errors of opinion are of little consequence so long as they are accompanied by the great principles of moral action and religious truth which guide and govern the soul; while the purest faith is of no value if unaccompanied by these great affecting principles. While we hold there-

fore that his speculations were far from correct, we yet think his change of character to have been most important and salutary. He was an unprincipled man, he became subject to principle; he had no settled or well grounded religious opinions, for he thought this a matter of no consequence, and was satisfied with a few prejudices; he became interested in inquiring, and adopted Calvinism. When his conscience was awakened, and he was stung with remorse at his wickedness and folly, he naturally attributed his past insensibility to the want of a right faith; and as through the example and influence of Newton, he changed his whole system, practical and theoretical, at once, he supposed that to be owing to his new peculiarities of doctrine, which in fact was owing to the new influence of those fundamental and universal principles, which he never had suffered to exert their power over him before.

It is from his own narrative, as contained in the celebrated *Force of Truth*, that we derive all the knowledge we have on this subject. This narrative has been circulated with incredible industry, and has been thought to contain irrefragable proof that there is no religion except with the orthodox. Scott probably thought so himself; for men of ardent temperament readily imagine it must be with every man as with themselves. They set up their own experience as the standard by which all others must stand or fall. He had himself been a hardened and hypocritical sinner while without orthodoxy; he charitably drew the inference that every other man without orthodoxy is so likewise; and published his own case to persuade the world of it. As this is the most important circumstance in his life, and his case is appealed to with triumphant confidence, we may be excused for taking this opportunity to venture a few remarks in regard to it.

The examination of his life and character as frankly unfolded by himself, will make it perfectly manifest, that he was an irreligious man, ignorant and prejudiced in his opinions, occasionally visited by compunctions of conscience, by opposing which he only made himself worse, but upon the whole given up to ambition and selfishness. Having incurred disgrace in his sixteenth year by dismissal from his apprenticeship for ill conduct, he suffered long and severely under the displeasure of his father. The exasperation of mind which this produced drove him to bad company and bad courses. 'Yet still,' he says, 'I not only had seasons of remorse, but, strange to say, continued to entertain thoughts of the university and of the clerical profession!' And as soon as he found that his father would carry his revenge so far as to cut him off from all decent provision at his death, then, in bitterness and anger, he left his father's house, to undertake the



sacred office. Nothing could be more unfit for it, than his habits and state of mind. 'While I was preparing for the solemn office,' he says, 'I lived as before in known sin, and in utter neglect of prayer, my whole preparation consisting of nothing else than an attention to those studies which were more immediately requisite for reputably passing through the previous examination.'

'Thus, with a heart full of pride and wickedness; my life polluted with many unrepented unforsaken sins; without one cry for mercy, one prayer for direction or assistance, or a blessing upon what I was about to do; after having concealed my real sentiments under the mask of general expressions; after having subscribed articles directly contrary to what I believed; and after having blasphemously declared, in the presence of God and of the congregation, in the most solemn manner, sealing it with the Lord's supper, that I judged myself to be "inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take that office upon me," (not knowing or believing that there was a Holy Ghost,) on *September* the 20th, 1772, I was ordained a *Deacon*.'

'My views, as far as I can ascertain them, were these three.—A desire of a less laborious and more comfortable way of procuring a livelihood, than otherwise I had the prospect of:—the expectation of more leisure to employ in reading, of which I was inordinately fond:—and a proud conceit of my abilities, with a vain-glorious imagination that I should some time distinguish and advance myself in the literary world. These were my ruling motives in taking this bold step: motives as opposite to those which should influence men to enter this sacred office, as pride is opposite to humility, ambition to contentment in a low estate, and a willingness to be the least of all and the servant of all; as opposite as love of self, of the world, of filthy lucre, and slothful ease, is to the love of God, of souls, and of the laborious work of the ministry.'

His whole conduct and habits during the first years of his ministry, corresponded with what is exhibited in these extracts.

'No sooner was I fixed in a curacy, than with close application I sat down to the study of the learned languages, and such other subjects as I considered most needful in order to lay the foundation of my future advancement. As a minister, I attended just enough to the public duties of my station, to support a decent character, which I deemed subservient to my main design; and from the same principle I aimed at morality in my outward deportment, and affected seriousness in my conversation. As to the rest, I still lived in the practice of what I knew to be sinful, and in the entire neglect of all secret religion: if ever inclined to pray, conscious guilt stopped my mouth, and I seldom went further than "God be merciful unto me."'

No one, after reading this, can think it strange, that his conscience should sometimes 'clamorously reproach him with base

hypocrisy.' He was thoroughly wrong, and needed to be converted.

But the argument is, that all this was owing to religious errors of doctrine, and that nothing better can be expected from the Socinian creed he held. He himself threw the odium and sin upon his faith, and his friends have endeavoured to smother it under the reproach.

In order however to make this argument of any validity, it must be shown that worldliness and hypocrisy like this never have existed in connexion with an orthodox faith. For if they have, then it cannot be inferred from their existence in any instance, that they are owing to the influence of heterodox opinions. If insincerity of profession and immorality of life will not prove the Calvinism which they accompany to be false, neither will they of themselves prove Socinianism to be false. The argument therefore amounts to nothing, for it is equally conclusive in establishing contradictions.

Further; in order to warrant the use which has been made of it, it should incontrovertibly appear, that Scott's opinions were the *cause* of his religious looseness. If a sect is to be decried and its sentiments pronounced ruinous and pernicious, because it has unregenerate and infamous members, which is the denomination that could survive? Even Christianity itself must be discarded if this ground is taken. You must trace the immorality to its cause, and find that cause to be the opinion, before you have any right to condemn that opinion. But in the instance before us, so far were his Socinian principles, as he styles them, from being the cause of his irreligious habits, that the fact was directly the reverse. He tells us again and again that he adopted those opinions for the sake of favouring his sin, and because he found that his conscience would sleep under them. So far is it from the fact that his character was the consequence of his creed. It was formed and fixed before his creed was adopted.

It may be said, that this is the same thing in substance, since his opinions suffered him to remain in his sin. But certainly this is nothing to the purpose, because orthodox opinions have also permitted men to remain in sin. Besides, it is perfectly clear, that, properly speaking, his speculative opinions whatever they were, neither occasioned, permitted, nor prevented his unworthiness. It was dependent on something entirely unconnected with them; and it began to give place, as we shall see presently, before his opinions had undergone any change. The reformation of his character commenced before his doctrinal speculations had been in any degree disturbed. Besides—there might



be some pretence for laying the guilt upon his opinions, if these had been formed with care and deliberation, and if he had himself regarded them as sacred or important. But this was far from being the case; and the fair inference is that the irreligion of his life was owing to the same want of principle which led him to adopt a system of faith without examination, and adhere to it through mere prejudice. It is irrational to attribute effects to the form of his faith, when it is so clear that in adopting that form he exercised precisely the sin which it is said to produce. He appears to have had no thought of choosing a system for its truth, and only considered whether it would suffer his conscience to be at peace. He took it from a single book, and fashioned it to the wishes of a depraved heart.

‘I met with a *Socinian* comment on the Scriptures, and greedily drank the poison, because it quieted my fears and flattered my abominable pride. The whole system coincided exactly with my inclinations and the state of my mind. In reading this exposition, sin seemed to lose its native ugliness, and to appear a very small and tolerable evil; man’s imperfect obedience seemed to shine with an excellency almost divine; and God appeared so entirely and necessarily merciful, that he could not make any of his creatures miserable without contradicting his natural propensity.’

He ought to have informed us what book this was, since it was the oracle of his faith. We never have met with one which answers the description. It may serve the turn of those who would keep up the cry against an unpopular and growing heresy; but a fair-minded man will hardly condemn a sect on account of a book which Scott read fifty years ago, the title of which he has not told us and nobody knows, and which seems to have long since perished, probably because it was so worthless and bad. That man’s principles must be past the danger of corruption, who could adopt such a system without examination, and imagine it to be the doctrines of the New Testament.

‘To these latter sentiments I acceded, and maintained them as long as I could; and I did it, most assuredly, because they soothed my conscience, freed me from the intolerable fears of damnation, and enabled me to think favourably of myself. For *these reasons alone* I loved and chose this ground: I fixed myself upon it, and there fortified myself by all the arguments and reasonings I could meet with. These things I wished to believe; and I had my wish; for at length I did most confidently believe them. Being taken captive in this snare by Satan, I should here have perished with a lie in my right hand, had not that Lord, whom I dishonoured, snatched me as a brand from the burning.’

It is to be remembered, in the mean time, that his ‘studies lay  
*New Series—vol. IV.*

very little in divinity.' 'As far as he understood such controversies, he was *nearly* a Socinian and Pelagian;' but from his own account he did not understand them at all, his studies had not laid that way. He was 'in a great measure a stranger to what the Calvinists could say for themselves—he did not think their answers worth reading—yet he harangued against them from the pulpit, and spared not to charge upon them consequences both absurd and shocking.' With the same violence and ignorance he assailed the Methodists; 'held them in sovereign contempt; spoke of them with derision; declaimed against them—was proudly and violently prejudiced against their persons and principles;' yet *had never read their books*.—From this and much more to the same purpose, it is plain that he held his opinions, such as they were, not from rational conviction, but from prejudice. This arose from the destitution of moral principle. His other faults sprung from the same cause, and not from his opinions. He was not misled by honest adherence to a wrong faith, but obstinate in dishonest, because wilful ignorance, and destitute of that sense of moral obligation which lies at the bottom of the religious character. How can it be pretended that his character resulted from his creed, when both were so manifestly produced by the same cause.

If one have adopted his opinions after careful inquiry, have held them with honest conviction, knowing how they are to be supported and defended, and have had all his principles of conduct associated with them,—and at last, upon further honest and serious inquiry, he abandon those opinions and adopt others; in this case, there may be a presumption that the last result of his thinking and seeking is the truth. His habitual uprightness and fairness and conscientiousness are pledges to us that he would not change lightly. He had no sinister, interested, unworthy motives for maintaining his former faith, we are persuaded that none such can influence him in this; and we owe to it the respect which is due to the sentiments of a fairminded sincere inquirer after truth. If there be ever any argument to be drawn from a man's change of faith, it must be in the case of a man like this. But every thing in the history of Scott was precisely the reverse of this. His first opinions were adopted hastily, from improper motives, and without examination. They were unaccompanied with any sense of personal religion. When his conscience was awakened, he fell into the company, and under the influence of John Newton, whose sincerity and fervour formed a striking contrast with his own character. As his opinions had been held in ignorance, he was amazed to find that those which he despised were in accordance with the articles he had engaged to support, and



that the homilies of the church were against him. He read Hooker, Beveridge, and other distinguished writers, felt ashamed of his former unreasonable prejudice, and followed them in one point after another, till he had got an entirely new set of opinions. One would have expected that in publishing to the world his account of so momentous a change, he would have exhibited the scriptural ground on which he rested, and justified himself by appeal to the infallible word of God. But although he seems to have read the bible at this time, yet it was with the eyes of his new oracles, and he was, according to his own account, far more impressed with the 'judicious' Hooker, and other authorities of the church, than with the scriptures. It is not lightly that we have said this. While his controversy with Newton was going on, that good man, who knew that nothing was to be hoped until Scott's heart should be touched with the power of religion, 'shunned every thing controversial, as much as possible, and filled his letters with the most useful and least offensive instructions.' This was the most likely method that he could take to win him to his sentiments; while Scott's letters betrayed such ignorance, and such incapacity of maintaining the ground on which he stood, that his opponent perceived that he must give way, and informed his friends that 'he was slowly though surely feeling his way to the knowledge of the truth.' The nature and measure of this ignorance may be inferred from the following fact.

'Immediately after the commencement of our correspondence, in May, 1775, whilst my thoughts were much engrossed by some hopes of preferment; one Sunday, during the time of divine service, when the psalm was named, I opened the prayer-book to turn to it: but (*accidentally* shall I say, or *providentially*?) I opened upon the Articles of Religion; and the eighth, respecting the authority and warrant of the Athanasian creed, immediately engaged my attention. My disbelief of the doctrine of a trinity of *coequal* persons in the unity of the Godhead, and my pretensions to candor, both combined to excite my hatred to this creed: for which reasons, I had been accustomed to speak of it with contempt, and to neglect reading it officially. No sooner therefore did I read the words, "That it was to be thoroughly received, and believed; for that it might be proved by most certain warrants of holy scripture;" than my mind was greatly impressed and affected. The matter of subscription immediately occurred to my thoughts, and from that moment I conceived such scruples about it, that, till my view of the whole system of Christianity was entirely changed, they remained insuperable.'

What man that holds his disbelief of this article from conscientious examination and with a religious sentiment, would ever be startled by finding it said in the Athanasian creed, that it might

be proved from the scripture? Are we to decide on religious opinions from the conversion of a man who had been living thus stupidly in the hatred of a doctrine which he professed every sabbath to believe, without having ever considered whether it could be proved from scripture or not? Feeling now for the first time a hesitation to subscribe what he did not believe, and then boasting of his 'integrity' and 'adherence to conscience,' in refusing to subscribe! We do not mean to doubt his conscience, or that he suffered extreme trials of spirit at this period; but we do protest against any inference in favour of the truth of any doctrine, from the fact that such a man under such circumstances was converted to it.

The same period was distinguished by the conversion of Theophilus Lindsey—of whom we are reminded by finding in one of Scott's letters of this date, 'Mr. Lindsey I think in many dangerous errors, and I am sorry my father has got his book.' Yet, if an argument could in any case be conclusively built on a change of opinions, it would be precisely in the case and under the circumstances of such a man as Lindsey. For many years he held a place in the established church, whose duties he faithfully performed, with a conscientious belief of its doctrines and a heart and life governed by a deep sense of religion. In these respects how different from Scott! Lindsey was for a long time deeply and severely exercised by his doubts and inquiries on some doctrinal subjects, and when he could no longer believe nor be excused from subscription, he sacrificed his living, and reputation, and friends, and cast himself on the broad world with no treasure but a good conscience. Scott, when his mind was aroused, after long hypocrisy and falsehood, had also no alternative but to believe or resign. To resign would have exposed him to all the evils which befel Lindsey, but he was persuaded by Hooker and Newton to believe. Lindsey was always conscientious, religious, and sincere, and by remaining so, lost his living. Scott became so at last, and thereby kept his living. Both doubtless suffered much in their feelings, their fame, and their worldly interests—but Lindsey's sacrifices were far greater and endured far longer. Scott from irreligion became a religious Calvinist. Lindsey under the influence of long established and habitual religious principle, changed his faith and became a Unitarian. Who can compare the two cases, and not perceive from which is to be drawn the strongest argument?

Indeed if so much is to be made of doctrinal conversions, the whole strength of the argument lies on one side. For innumerable instances may be adduced of orthodox men becoming Unitarians, in defiance of prejudice, at the risk of worldly interest,



and notwithstanding they had religiously lived by and advocated orthodox opinions. Priestley and Belsham are incomparably stronger examples than any one which history furnishes on the other side—the latter of whom exchanged his learned and well established Calvinism for Unitarianism, while in the very act of striving to support it. We might add the names of many men well known in our country, whose uprightness and piety were never for a moment questioned, either while they zealously and ably maintained their orthodoxy, or since they have with equal zeal and ability supported, and suffered for supporting, the obnoxious heresy of Unitarianism. Who that has any fairness of judgment does not discern far more of the force of truth in the history and conversion of Noah Worcester than in those of Thomas Scott? Yet the world is filled with the story of this almost solitary example on that side; after the lapse of nearly half a century it is still repeated, and sent abroad with the sound of triumph. The report that Henry Kirke White was converted by it,\* accompanies it, and love for the poet is called in to procure it readers, and aid its impression. The multitude is made to believe that all Unitarians are as bad as Scott was, and all Calvinists as good as he became;—while the more than two thousand opposite conversions which have taken place during the same period, are little thought of and allowed to weigh nothing—their very frequency and commonness taking off the impression of their importance.

We cannot add to these remarks, which we fear may seem too desultory, the many other observations which crowd upon our minds concerning this subject—for we must hasten on with the narrative of the life. From the time that this change of character and opinion took place, he devoted the zealous labours of a long life to the cause of religion. And whatever we may think of his speculative errors, we cannot deny him the praise of indefatigable exertion in favour of practical as well as doctrinal religion. It generally happens that a convert lays the greatest stress of importance on that part of religion from which he was formerly most distant. So it was in this instance. He was attached strongly to his system of doctrines. But it was not in doctrines that the essence of his conversion consisted. This was primarily and principally a practical reformation, and he ever after appears to have laid far greater stress on practical religion, than most of those with whom he was connected. In his own

\* This story, which has been spread with wonderful zeal, and has had great effect in procuring readers to the *Force of Truth*, turns out to be a fabrication. Mr. Southey tells us, in the volume of *Remains* lately published, that White was so far from being influenced by the book, that he returned it 'with disapprobation.'

experience doctrine had been a secondary thing, and he represented it as such to others. 'If you ask me,' he says in a letter, 'what my belief is, I am willing to declare it; but otherwise I have no ambition to make proselytes to an opinion. My design is to make converts to the substantial duties of a religious and godly life, &c.' Indeed it was his singular fate, Calvinist as he was, to be suspected and persecuted as an Arminian, because he preached so practically. The party in the church to which he was attached, was upon the very verge of Antinomianism. Many of the most zealous, indeed, did not hesitate openly to insist that faith alone was important, and that to preach works was to preach not the gospel but the law, and to reduce the free children of God to the bondage of the old dispensation. As Scott could not endure this doctrine, but opposed it openly and vehemently, he was extensively an object of jealousy and dislike and opposition. In the Miscellaneous Collections of our last number, is an anecdote to which we refer in illustration of this remark. In his letters he is constantly alluding to the subject in strains like the following:

'Sure I am that evangelical religion is in many places wofully verging to antinomianism,—one of the vilest heresies that ever Satan invented; our natural pride and carnality being both humoured and fed by it, under the plausible pretence of exalting free grace, and debasing human nature. But whilst antinomians talk of the grace of the gospel, they overturn all revealed religion.' \* \* \* 'The *conversion* of the antinomian, notwithstanding all his good feelings, only leaves him tenfold more a hater of the God of the Bible, than he was before. This, my friend,' he proceeds, 'I am sure of, and see more and more clearly every day; and the enmity of loose professors against searching, practical preaching, is full proof of it: and by God's grace I purpose to spend my whole life in bearing testimony against it; and shall rejoice in having you for a helper. In this work we must expect no quarter, either from the world, or some kind of professors.'

'I have a few even at Olney who cleave to me, and a small number of those who are my own: but I labour under great discouragement in this respect, and am generally looked upon as unsound, legal, Arminian. The truth of the matter is, upon mature deliberation I am convinced that the preaching of the present day is not practical enough, or sufficiently *distinguishing* between true and false experience.'

'I am myself very busy, very unpopular, and a *little* useful. I hope to see greater things. Religion of a certain stamp is very fashionable in town, and I get much displeasure for opposing fashionable religion: but I trust God is with me, and that there is an increasing number of helpers.'



In 1780, when Mr. Newton\* removed to London, Scott succeeded him at Olney. The people however were divided, the opposition to him was powerful, and his ministry on the whole was so uncomfortable, that he at length determined to remove. In speaking of his removal he has occasion to mention the poet Cowper, and we therefore extract the following passage.

‘My outward circumstances were now in some measure improved at Olney; and my ministry, though unpopular, was in many instances evidently blessed: yet I never could make up my mind to continue there.’

‘I had not, however, the most distant prospect of any other situation: and my unpopularity at Olney was itself a powerful bar to my obtaining any. This may be judged of by the following incident. I went to London, as I was accustomed to do once a year, and I was asked to preach by a friend whom I had heard with profit as early as I so heard any one, and for whom I had repeatedly preached before. But, just as I was going into the pulpit, he said to me, “Do not *scold* my people, as I have heard you do the people at Olney?” This did not seem well timed. He, however, unreservedly testified his approbation of the sermon, which I was, notwithstanding, enabled to preach. But it shews the reprehensions which were spread of my ministry, and how unfavourable they would be to my desire of a change of situation.

‘Mr. Cowper, in letters to Mr. Newton, which have since been published by Mr. Hayley, and which pretty generally found their way into the Reviews, brought the same charge against me, in strong terms; which, coming from so eminent and popular a character, must have great weight. But Mr. C., it should be known, never heard me preach: neither did Mrs. Unwin; nor their more respectable friends. Mr. C.’s information concerning my preaching was derived from the very persons, whose doctrinal and practical antinomianism I steadily confronted.—Notwithstanding these harsh censures, however, God blessed my ministry at Olney to the conversion of many; and to effectually repressing the antinomian spirit which had gone forth in the place: and thus it was made subservient to the usefulness of my successors, who were not bowed down with the same load of unpopularity that I was.’

‘In explanation of what is here mentioned concerning Mr. Cowper’s never hearing my father preach, it should be remembered, that one feature of the unhappy illusion, under which that admired character laboured, was a persuasion that it was his duty to abstain

\* In the account of Newton’s ministry at Olney, we find the following note, which is well worth transcribing.

‘Be hospitable, said Mr. Thornton, and keep an open house for such as are worthy of entertainment: help the poor and needy: I will stately allow you 200*l.* a year, and readily send whenever you have occasion to draw for more.—Mr. N. told me, that he thought he had received of Mr. Thornton upwards of 3000*l.* in this way, during the time he resided at Olney.’—Life of Newton, by Cecil.

from religious worship. I believe I am correct in stating the fact thus generally : certainly, at least, he abstained from *public* worship, as from a blessing prohibited to *him* : and I think I have a distinct recollection, that, though he might suffer prayer to be offered in the room with him, he declined joining in it.—Mrs. Unwin never quitted the object of her assiduous care.’

While Lady Austen was in Olney she resided at Mr. Scott’s house ; and there it was, he says,

‘ Most of those events which are recorded in the life of Cowper, as pertaining to this period, occurred. Here “ the Task ” was imposed and undertaken. Here “ John Gilpin ” was told as a story, in prose, and the plan formed of giving it circulation in verse. Some things in the published account are not very accurately stated, as I know, who saw the springs which moved the machine, and which could not be seen by a more distant spectator, or mere visitant.’

In 1785, Scott was chosen chaplain at the Lock Hospital. But his removal brought him neither popularity nor peace. It was only passing to another scene of trial and vexation. The Lock Hospital was the head quarters of antinomianism, ‘ that loose and notional religion,’ against which he had declared a war of extermination. The board of governors was split into parties, all thinking they had a right to dictate to the preachers, and the two chaplains of the place were of unlike sentiments and characters. He had to struggle too with the poverty of a very scanty salary, while he added to the hardships and fatigues of his situation, by taking on himself services and lectureships, unconnected with the Hospital. The course of his usual Sunday duty at this time, is thus described by a lady who resided in his family.

‘ At four o’clock in the morning of every alternate Sunday, winter as well as summer, the watchman gave one heavy knock at the door, and Mr. S. and an old maid-servant arose,—for he could not go out without his breakfast. He then set forth to meet a congregation at a church in Lothbury, about three miles and a half off ;—I rather think the only church in London attended so early as six o’clock in the morning. I think he had from two to three hundred auditors, and administered the sacrament each time. He used to observe that, if at any time, in his early walk through the streets in the depth of winter, he was tempted to complain, the view of the newsmen equally alert, and for a very different object, changed his repinings into thanksgivings.—From the city he returned home, and about ten o’clock assembled his family to prayers : immediately after which he proceeded to the chapel, where he performed the whole service, with the administration of the sacrament on the alternate Sundays, when he did not go to Lothbury. His sermons, you know, were most ingeniously brought into an exact hour ; just about the same time, as I have heard him say, being spent in com-



posing them I well remember accompanying him to the afternoon church in Bread Street, (nearly as far as Lothbury,) after his taking his dinner without sitting down. On this occasion I hired a hackney-coach: but he desired me not to speak, as he took that time to prepare his sermon. I have calculated that he could not go much less than fourteen miles in the day, frequently the whole of it on foot, besides the three services, and at times a fourth sermon at Long-acre Chapel, or elsewhere, on his way home in the evening: and then he concluded the whole with family prayer, and that not a very short one.—Considering his bilious and asthmatic habit, this was immense labour. And all this I knew him to do very soon after, if not the very next Sunday after, he had broken a rib by falling down the cabin stairs of a Margate packet: and it seemed to me as if he passed few weeks without taking an emetic.\*

It was during the period of his residence at the Lock, that he began his principal work, the Family Bible—a work which occupied his attention to the day of his death. So injudiciously was the publication of this book managed, that although it was popular and the sales large, yet the author was kept by it in constant pecuniary embarrassment and sometimes in extreme distress. We cannot give a detail of the vexations and harassing trials to which he was exposed. We can only present a few extracts, which may give some idea of the laborious industry and severe perplexity in midst of which it was accomplished. ‘Four years, five months, and one day, were employed on the work,’ he says, ‘with unknown sorrow and vexation.’

‘This great work of my father’s life was begun January 2, 1788; the first number was published March 22, following; and the last copy was finished for the press, June 2, 1792: during which period the whole was twice written over by his own hand. One great error committed was, beginning to publish so soon after entering upon the composition. This caused the author to be distressingly hurried throughout his whole progress. Sick or well, he was obliged to complete his weekly task; except as in some few instances he was compelled to plead for a short respite, by the suspension of the publication. I have actually known him, with great difficulty and suffering, prepare as much copy as he thought would complete the current num-

\* ‘It is implied in the above account, that my father’s sermons were usually composed the same day they were delivered. This was literally the case. For more than five and thirty years, he never put pen to paper in preparing for the pulpit, except in the case of three or four sermons, preached on particular occasions, and expressly intended for publication: yet no one who heard him would complain of crudeness or want of thought in his discourses: they were rather faulty in being overcharged with matter, and too argumentative for the generality of hearers.—Indeed, an eminent chancery lawyer used to say that he heard him for professional improvement, as well as for religious edification; for that he possessed the close argumentative eloquence peculiarly requisite at that bar, and which is found to be so rare an endowment.’

ber, and then, when he had retired to bed and taken an emetic, called up again to furnish more, what he had provided being insufficient for the purpose !

‘The cost of the first edition (amounting to three thousand copies,) was not less, I believe, than 6,000*l.* or 7,000*l.* The publisher reckoned it at 10,000*l.* or 11,000*l.*

‘The work extended, indeed, much beyond its proposed limits, reaching to one hundred and seventy-four numbers instead of one hundred and forty, to which it had been fixed : but all beyond the one hundred and forty numbers I printed at my own expence and risque ; and all beyond one hundred and sixty-four I actually gave away to all purchasers of the work who would accept them ; though that portion cost me much above 200*l.*

‘At the close I calculated, in the most favourable manner, my own pecuniary concern in the work : and the result was, that as nearly as I could ascertain, I had neither gained nor lost, but had performed the whole for nothing.’

Within five months his publisher failed ; and thus, he says,

‘All my little property, arising from a legacy of 150*l.* from a relation, another of 100*l.* from John Thornton, Esq., and some others of smaller amount, was sunk as in a vortex ; and I was left at least 500*l.* in debt. I lost full 500*l.* by the publication, besides all my labour, and 200*l.* given me by friends in consideration of what had occurred.’

He was encouraged to undertake a second edition, the sale of which ‘scarcely cleared more than the prime cost ;’ and he himself ‘actually paid at the rate of 13*l.* for every additional sheet, for the privilege of improving the work.’ On the conclusion of the third edition, in 1811, he says, ‘I certainly have not cleared so much as 1,000*l.* by the labours of above twenty-one years.’

The embarrassments into which he was thrown during this period, gave occasion to an expression of regard from his friends and that portion of the church for which he had laboured, which it is gratifying to record. He considered himself as having

‘some claim upon the religious public ; and the way in which he proposed to avail himself of it was, merely soliciting his friends, by a private circular, to find him purchasers for his “Theological Works,” which he was willing, in this way, to dispose of at a reduced price. “Could I turn three or four hundred copies of the Works into money,” he says, “it would set me at liberty.” This was accordingly the plan adopted. The printing of this collection of his works, he considered as “the most imprudent part of his whole concern in that line,” and as having “involved him almost inextricably :” but it now proved the means of relieving him effectually, and beyond the most sanguine expectations.’



Such was the promptitude with which relief was afforded, that he immediately received from Cambridge, 590*l.* a present, besides a considerable sum for books. His letters of this date speak thus on the subject.

'January 17, 1814: "I have received in all from different quarters, and from those of whom I had never heard the name . . . quite enough to pay all my debts: and, as I have reason to think, that most, if not all, the copies of the works will be disposed of, I now have all and abound."'

'February 14, 1814: "I really expected, at first, little more than to dispose of two or three hundred copies of the works, and I never intimated a desire of further help than in that way. You have heard what I received from Mr. S. . . . Since then, money has been sent me, with the most cordial, respectful letters, from persons of whom I never heard: among the rest, 20*l.* from a quaker. Offers were made of raising more, if I desired it; which I declined. Probably all the copies of the works will be sold. I do not now owe any thing which I cannot pay on demand—what I never could say since you were born! and I have something in hand; and shall receive more, besides the works.'

'I stated, that *I had all and abounded*, and did not wish to trouble my friends further, except as subscribers to the works. But I, next letter, received 115*l.* as a present!—I have had 350*l.* from Bristol, where I thought my rudeness had given offence; besides orders for a hundred copies of the works!"

'Another letter to my brother, ten days afterwards, states that Mr. Cooke had remitted 200*l.* more from Bristol! and my father adds in a postscript.

'February 25, 1814. I have received at least 2,000*l.* as presents in little more than two months, besides the sale of books!!'

'The trials and difficulties' which rendered Scott's abode at the Lock Hospital unhappy, were ended in 1801, by his removal to Aston, in which situation he continued, active and laborious, to the time of his death. In 1807, he engaged in the instruction of young men, who were designed to be sent abroad as missionaries by the Church Missionary Society. To this care he devoted much of his time for seven years, and notwithstanding his advanced age applied himself for their sake to the learning of several new languages. Of this society he was an ardent friend and patron, as he was also of other similar institutions. He took a lively interest in the cause of the Jews, and published concerning them and for them a work, which he supposed to be in some considerable measure original, and likely to do something toward effecting their conversion.

After this period, 1814, little is recorded in the volume before us, except what is designed 'to display the temper of his mind,

and the spirit by which he was actuated.' Of this portion of the book, which extends through 170 pages, and consists principally of extracts from his and his children's letters, a minute account of his last illness, with a journal of his conduct, feelings, and conversation, during that period, and an abstract of his character and works; we can give no very particular epitome. Many of his letters are very fine, producing a favourable impression of his vigour of mind, judgment, and affectionate desire of doing good. And from the whole, though there are some things which are injudiciously inserted, yet it is impossible not to gather a high respect for his christian character, and to regard him as an example worthy of imitation in his laudable devotion to the great purpose of his life, his indefatigable labours, his zealous and self-denying perseverance, his habitual piety. He died after a severe illness, on the 16th of April, 1821, in the 65th year of his age. Instead of copying any of the numerous and high wrought eulogies, which are collected together from various sources, we conclude our article with an extract which gives a favourable view of some of his private habits.

'It may be interesting to some persons to know his usual mode of spending his time, when exposed to no particular interruptions.

'Unlike most men who have accomplished great things in life, he was never, till quite his latter years, an early riser. This, indeed, might be sufficiently accounted for, by the disturbed nights which he often passed, owing to his asthmatic complaint. He usually rose about seven, and retired to rest about eleven o'clock. But during some late years he rose frequently between five and six. At these times he often spent three hours alone in his study before breakfast. His seasons of private devotion were always, I believe, immediately after rising, and again from eight to nine o'clock in the evening. There were times also in which he had periods of retirement in the middle of the day: and occasionally he observed days of fasting and more special devotion.

'After breakfast followed his family exposition and worship, which often occupied three quarters of an hour, or even still more time. He next, while he had missionaries or other pupils under his care, applied himself to their instruction: and then pursued his own studies till near the hour of dinner. His time for exercise and for making his pastoral visits was generally the afternoon. For some years his chief exercise was the cultivation of his garden; but latterly, from the necessity of a recumbent posture, much of the time which he had been used to give to this employment was passed upon his bed.—After tea he was again occupied in his study till the hour for family worship arrived: after which a light supper, followed by a little conversation, closed the day.

'He was, as Mr. Wilson has observed, "always employed, but



never in a hurry." His method of "gleaning," as he termed it, by always having a book at hand for spare portions of time, he himself has described and recommended in a letter which has been inserted. But he *gleaned* by conversation with all who came in his way, upon such subjects as they understood, as well as from books. He thought it of much advantage to a clergyman to understand common affairs, particularly those connected with the employments of his people. "When they saw that he understood things belonging to *their* profession, it would make them," he said, "give him credit for more competency to instruct them in what pertained to his own."—Indeed his active mind employed itself vigorously upon all subjects which came before it; and particularly upon the passing events of the world, as they affected the interests of the Christian church, or of his country, and the consequent duties of himself, and his people.

'Till his spirits had been completely worn down by labours and infirmities, he possessed great cheerfulness and vivacity; which especially displayed themselves in times of sickness.—He was a man of much conversation. All his studies and pursuits were talked over with his family. He was indeed always and every where διδακτικός, "apt to teach:"\* we might even be ready to term him, as St. Paul was termed, επιρρολογος,† if that word may be taken, as our version appears to take it, for one who scatters his words, like seed, all around him. In confirmation of this the scenes of the Margate packets may be recalled to mind. I will mention also another incident which recalled, though it may appear trivial, will illustrate my position, and his character.—In one of my journeys to Aston, I took with me, as nurse maid, a young woman of but slender capacity, though I hope of good principles; and it amused and interested me to learn that this poor girl, when charged with the care of a young child, could find no way of passing her time so agreeably, as in standing or walking about near my father, while he worked in his garden. He so explained to her his various operations, and the intended result of them, with appropriate observations, that her attention was quite engaged. And by means resembling this it was, that his domestics gradually acquired a degree of information, which made them appear enlightened persons in comparison with what is generally found in that rank of life. And hence too it was, as well as for the great spiritual benefit which most of them derived from his instructions, that, without contracting any disrespectful familiarity, they became attached to him in a very uncommon degree.

'In this connexion I may mention what has left a pleasing and affecting impression upon my memory from my early days. His returns from visiting his late flock at Ravenstone, when he lived at Olney, were always interesting occasions, while he talked over with my mother all that he had observed in their state. At these times,

\* 1 Tim. iii. 2. 2 Tim. ii. 24.

† Acts xvii. 18.

I suppose from sympathy with his hopes and fears, his joys and sorrows respecting them, it was very gratifying to me to stand by, a silent listener to the conversation.

‘In like manner the peculiar piety, cheerfulness and affection which marked the discourse that took place on a Sunday evening, (notwithstanding the very discouraging circumstances against which my father had to contend,) early made a strong impression upon my mind of the *happiness* of true religion.

‘Generally I may say, that my father was very strict about the observance of the sabbath in his family. All domestic work, that could be anticipated, was done the evening before : and cooking on the Sunday was avoided, that the whole family, if not otherwise prevented, might attend public worship. Yet, as may be collected from the fact just related, his piety was cheerful as well as strict.

“Improv’d and soften’d by the day,  
All things another aspect wore.”

‘In one respect a deficiency may have been felt in these memoirs — my father never, I believe, at least, never since a very early period, wrote any private papers, relative to what passed in his own mind. Pious persons have differed in judgment upon this practice. His judgment was not against it : but it was not his habit. Nor has he left any writings beyond what are now printed, which can be communicated to the public—unless it be additional letters in the hands of his friends.—At the same time that I make this remark, I may be permitted to observe, that he much deprecated the publication of such letters, unless (what he apprehended might not be attainable,) they could be previously submitted to persons in whose judgment he could confide. He thought that the memory of many good men had been injured by such publications.\*—I confess it is with some trepidation, as to what might have been his own judgment upon the subject, that I now lay so much of his private correspondence before the public : but all, I persuade myself, will feel that I have given them much that is truly valuable : and, under the sanction and authority which death has added to his character, he may now speak *some* things publicly, which perhaps propriety or expediency required that he should before say only in private to his friends. If I have in any important instance exceeded that moderate licence which this consideration would allow, there is nothing for which I should feel more unfeigned regret.’

\* See his Practical Observations on Deut. xxxiv.



## ARTICLE XVIII.

*A Sermon on the Religious Opinions of the present Day, delivered in two parts, morning and afternoon, on Lord's Day Sept. 23, 1821, to the Church and Congregation in Jamaica Plain, Roxbury. By THOMAS GRAY, A.M. Their Pastor. Published by request of the hearers. Second Edition. Boston.*

WE think these sermons adapted to do good. They are written with judgment and an excellent spirit. They present a brief sketch of the peculiar opinions of the principal sects now prevalent, taken in the main from their own standard works, given in a popular manner without comments, but so presented as to be brought into pretty direct contrast without forestalling the judgment of the inquirer. The survey is concluded with some remarks of a practical and valuable character. We quote with much pleasure a few paragraphs.

‘The survey, we have here taken, may and ought to teach all of us, the importance of searching the Scriptures for ourselves as the only foundation of our faith and practice. We are accountable to God for the correctness of our faith so far and no farther than as we possess the means of acquiring it. We possess these means; we have the Bible in our hands; we have reason and understanding to guide our inquiries; and if diligent in our search after truth, if humble in our attempts and earnest in prayers to God to enlighten our minds, and grant us the teachings of his spirit, we shall not fail to attain to all that is necessary to know in order to our salvation.’

‘Diversity of opinion there always has been, and always will be amongst men. To bring all men to one standard of religious faith, would be as vain an attempt as to bring them all to the same measure of height and stature.—No two leaves on any tree are exactly similar; and minds are as variously constituted as bodies. Variety, in short, is nature's great law. Diversity of opinion gives exercise for mutual condescensions, for charity, for free inquiry, and for fearless exercise of our reasoning faculties; without which these virtues would have no scope; and good thus results from it. “Lightnings and earthquakes break not God's design.” It is the variety of tones that produces the sweetest chords, whilst one unvarying note would tire and disgust. It is the variety of nature, that imparts to it its lovelier charms.—All will be harmony in religion, when men will agree to differ, will allow the right of private judgment and cease to withhold the christian name from those who differ from themselves. Only about one fifth part of the human race have, as yet embraced the christian religion under any form, and that single fifth part is divided into above five hundred different sects. Amongst all these there are undoubtedly many honest, many sincere inquirers

after truth, whom God approves and will finally accept notwithstanding the mistakes of their heads.'

The following passages have great propriety.

'One concluding remark addresses itself to that large portion of persons whose time is unavoidably engrossed by the cares and concerns of life, or whose hours of religious study are principally confined to the Sabbath day. It is no uncommon thing for such persons to perplex themselves with different sects and opinions, and to display all their zeal upon the hidden and mysterious parts of Scripture, as though religion were a system of discordant opinions, instead of being what it really is, a rule of daily practice.——It would contribute much more to the cause of christian truth, and much better to their own comfort and improvement, if they bestowed their exclusive attention upon the *obvious* doctrines and practical precepts of the gospel, and less upon mysteries and speculations, which tend to strife and discord, rather than to edification and brotherly love. Whatever these may effect, one thing is certain, that they neither enlighten the mind, nor mend the heart, nor improve the morals; and they certainly do not sweeten the temper. They lead men only to contend so warmly for what they do not understand, that they are in danger of forgetting to practise what is most important for them to perform. And remember that is the best religion which leads us best to fulfil our duties. He who does justly, loves mercy, and walks humbly with God, is most acceptable to him; and he who thus aims to be good will not finally fail to be happy.'—

We have quoted largely, because we think such sentiments as these cannot fail to be useful, and should be perpetually inculcated. The diversities of opinion, which prevail in the christian church, are countless. Disputes on the subject of religion began even while our Master was himself on earth; and after the progress of eighteen centuries, and the labours of the boldest and most indefatigable inquiry, and in the enjoyment of the richest advantages, which learning has afforded, mankind seem to have made little progress towards a complete agreement. We look back upon the persecutions and miseries to which religion has been made instrumental, with horror; and we regard with deep emotion the malignity, which rankles in the religious controversies of the present day, and calls up the different sects in fierce array against each other. Yet although this opposition of sentiment has brought with it many and tremendous evils, it has not been without its advantages; and we may not doubt that under the providence of God, it will in the end conduce to good.

We can have no distrust of the ultimate and complete triumphs of reason and truth. That period is remote, yet its approach is certain; for can we not discern the signs of the times? Whatever contributes to enlighten the community, in any of its depart-



ments, is a contribution, which will not be in vain, towards this glorious result. The bare statement of error, unaccompanied by any comments, is often of great service to the cause of truth. Men, heated by controversy and fired with the ambition of victory, have their vision commonly not a little disordered; as we are accustomed to say in some other cases, they see but poorly. So it happens that religious controversy seldom effects any change in the opinions of those who are not predisposed to a change, or wavering and unsettled in their religious views. So much of passion in such cases mingles with all our judgments, that we hold on to our errors with a pertinacity corresponding to the force by which they are attempted to be wrested from us; and long after we are convinced that we have taken a wrong road, we shut our eyes, and then quiet our consciences by saying that we do not see that we are wrong. But if we can show men their errors without giving them reason to suspect that we have any improper design upon their faith, if we can, from writers whose authority is indisputable, by a fair and impartial statement of the false and absurd sentiments which they hold, induce them to examine and to reflect upon them in a dispassionate manner, we have grounds to hope for success. Inquiry, serious calm inquiry, is what we ought most to desire and to aim to induce in men. Let us persuade them, if we can, to subject their religious opinions, as they would bring any other opinions, to the test of reason and common sense. When men can thus be brought to look calmly at what they have professed to believe, they will often start back with affright from the hideous deformity of a creed to which, before they perfectly saw its character, they clung with extreme obstinacy.—Inquiry, we repeat it, is all we ask for. It is upon the gradual illumination of the human mind that we rely for the progress of true religion. Docility, intelligence, knowledge, are its most powerful auxiliaries. Superstition and fanaticism present no impassable barrier to the progress of truth, if men can only be persuaded to judge for themselves what is right, to maintain the independence of their own minds, and take common sense and reason as their guides. Printing, education, civilization, are doing in our community every thing for religion. In the spirit of inquiry, which pervades all classes, and in the facilities of knowledge, which are afforded to all, we place our most sanguine hopes; and in every advance, made in the improvement of the human mind, in every inducement and advantage, offered to lead men to think for themselves, we hail an omen, auspicious to the interests of true Christianity.

## INTELLIGENCE.

---

ON Tuesday, the 5th Nov. inst. the Second Congregational Society in Lynn, Mass. proceeded to lay the Corner Stone of the Meeting House, which they are now building, with appropriate solemnities. After prayers on the occasion, and singing, the Stone was fixed in its place, a plate with the following inscription, and other mementos, having been previously deposited under it.

There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. II. 5.

God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.

The Second Congregational Society in Lynn,  
maintaining in their fullest extent  
The Rights of Conscience and of Private Judgment in Religion,  
and

The Principles of Universal Charity,  
was established, and this House, devoted to  
The worship of the Only Living and True God,  
The God and Father of Jesus Christ our Lord,  
was founded under their patronage, in the year of the  
Christian Era 1822.

May God give the Increase.

The subjoined address was then delivered by the Rev. Joseph Tuckerman, of Chelsea, to a numerous, attentive, and satisfied audience. It is, we think, what it ought to have been. This society has grown up under favourable auspices. Commenced as we have reason to believe, under serious convictions of duty, established upon the best principles, inquisitive in the pursuit of truth, and cultivating good will towards their fellow christians of every denomination, we can have no doubt of prosperity; and confidently trust, that this establishment, under an enlightened and faithful ministry, may prove a rich blessing to its founders and their descendants, and an honour to the Christian community.

*Address, delivered at Lynn, November 5th, 1822, on the occasion of laying the corner stone of the second congregational church in that town.*

WE have assembled to lay the corner stone of an edifice, to be erected for the worship of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only living and true God; whose we are, and whose



are all things in heaven and in earth ; to whom be ascribed all glory and dominion forever.

By this act, then, we profess our faith in the religion of Christ ; we profess to receive Jesus Christ our Lord in all the offices, in which he is revealed to us in the gospel ; we acknowledge the divine authority of all the precepts and institutions of his religion ; and our entire reliance for final acceptance, and for eternal happiness, on our fidelity to the conditions, on which they are offered in the gospel of our salvation.

Nor is this all. By this act, christian brethren, you assert and exercise the right of private judgment in religion. You have withdrawn from those with whom you have been accustomed to worship, that you may enjoy a worship, that is in accordance with your convictions of the truth as it is in Jesus. And this right is readily conceded to you alike by those, who most deeply pity what they think to be your delusion, and who most severely condemn the doctrine, which they consider as a fatal error. Thanks be to God, that we live in a day, when the rights of conscience are so well understood ; and when, by the moral power of opinion, exerted through the whole community around us, these rights are so extensively and effectually secured. It is the most distinguishing characteristic, and the richest blessing, of that improvement which the progress of knowledge has given to society, and especially, to the civil institutions of our happy country, that while it has rescued our religion itself from the shackles, so long imposed on it by human legislation, it has awakened, and brought into exercise, a feeling as extensive, of the paramount worth and importance of our rights as christians. But let us not forget, that every blessing is a responsibility ; and that rights of every kind imply duties of proportionate solemnity and obligation.

May we then worship God in the manner in which we believe that he requires to be worshipped ? may we follow out the convictions of our own mind on the questions of the person of our Lord, of his offices, and of the eternal life that is before us ? We claim these rights as the gift of God, through Jesus Christ. To God, then, and to Christ, we owe the corresponding duties, to inquire for christian truth with an earnestness proportioned to its worth ; and to maintain a simplicity and singleness of mind, which will give to truth an uncontrolled influence over our judgments and conduct. He is guilty of unfaithfulness to God and to Christ, who asserts the rights of conscience, and who maintains not a mind open to conviction ; or who values any interest, as he values that of truth. And do we demand of our fellow men, the *acknowledgement* of these as our inalienable rights ? Let us extend then to their opinions, to their usages, and to their rights, the

respect which we claim for our own. To this charity,—or rather, may I not say, to this equal justice,—our religion calls us ; and, whatever may be our provocations, let us never violate it.

We are distinguished among christians, as *Unitarians* ; and we feel less reluctance in admitting this designation, because we had rather be distinguished by a term which marks one of the most important of the differences between us and other christians, than receive a name, by which we might be enrolled as followers, or disciples, of any other master than Jesus Christ. We build our conviction of the perfect unity of God, and our sentiments of the person and offices of him *whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world, on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.* Unitarianism, we are therefore persuaded, will prevail, till it shall be universal. As the scriptures have been more thoroughly investigated, it has prevailed. And it is not among the least interesting circumstances of this time, when the simple unity of God has been controverted with all the learning, skill and zeal, that could be brought to bear upon it, that its ablest opponents have given up many of the strong holds, on which their predecessors have relied with the greatest confidence for their defence. New concessions, we doubt not, will still be made, and new advances of truth obtained, till every church will be consecrated to the worship of the one God ; and christians of every name will confess Jesus to be their Lord, *to the glory of God the Father.*

God dwelleth not indeed, exclusively, in temples made with hands ; yet he regards with favour, and blesses with his presence, the house that is reared to his name, and consecrated to his service. To his name then, and to his service, from the beginning of it, we devote the work of this place. Here may a church arise, in which the Father of spirits will be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Here may faith in Christ be strengthened in the hearts of multitudes, who now believe in him ; and here may your children, and your children's children, be reared in the knowledge of God, and of his son Jesus Christ, whom to know aright is life eternal. Here, christian brethren, associated in this pious work, may you find a place for your solemn assemblies, which will be made holy to God, by the holy affections and purposes with which you engage in his worship, and observe the ordinances which Christ has instituted. Here may your thanksgivings arise, an offering of pure incense ; and here may you bring your penitential confessions, and obtain their acceptance. Here may you acquire fortitude and resolution in all the trials, and consolation in all the afflictions of life ; and here may christian excitement be received, and christian hope and charity es-



tablished and enlarged, till you shall be prepared to be dwellers and worshippers in a house that hath foundations, eternal, in the heavens.

Finally, brethren, may the Lord bless you, and keep you! The Lord make his face shine upon you, and be gracious to you. The Lord lift up his countenance upon you, and give you peace. The Lord prosper your work, and give you to see the end of it in humble joy and thanksgiving. And may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with all our spirits!

---

*The Evangelical Missionary Society in Massachusetts* held its annual meeting in Boston, on Thursday, October 3d, in the vestry of the church in Federal Street. After the transaction of the usual business, the society attended religious services in the church in Federal Street, where prayers were offered, and the annual discourse was delivered by the Rev. John Bartlett, of Marblehead, from Romans x. 1. 'Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they may be saved.' A collection was afterwards made. The following is the substance of the Report, which was offered to the society by the Trustees.

The Trustees submit to the society the following Report of their proceedings for the year past, and of the labours of the Missionaries, who have been employed in the service of the society.

The situation of Brooklyn in Connecticut is already known to the society; and has continued to receive, as it appeared to demand, the particular attention of the Trustees. In the course of February last, a committee from their society was sent to communicate with the board, and from the information given of their state and prospects, and the strong desires they expressed of continued aid, the Trustees had no doubt of the propriety of continuing the assistance hitherto granted. Mr. Samuel J. May, whose services among them have been highly acceptable, and whom they have been desirous of establishing in the ministry, has, at their request, been ordained by a council in Boston, and has now for several months been labouring among them in the word and ordinances. The strong interest they express in his services, and their unanimity amidst the difficulties with which they have been called to contend, give them an additional claim to the sympathy, and as far as possible, to the co-operation of the society.

The Rev. Silas Warren has continued his labours at Jackson; and as the best evidence of his acceptance and usefulness, the numbers and means of his society have been enlarged, particu-

larly during the past year. They are about erecting a place of worship at their own expense; and they hope that in a short time they shall be enabled to support the ministry wholly among themselves. But with the additional burdens, which the building of their church may impose, they solicit the continuance of our aid for two or three years more. In the letters recently received from the committee of their society, they express their very sincere thanks for the countenance granted them in years past, 'without which,' they say, 'we should probably have been destitute of the enjoyment of the means of the Gospel.'

The schools which have been formed under the direction and influence of Mr. Warren are in a flourishing state; and the Trustees have the satisfaction to believe his pious and indefatigable efforts in that region have been followed with a distinguished blessing. The society for the propagation of the Gospel having however since the last annual meeting appointed him one of their missionaries, and taken upon themselves part of his compensation, the Trustees have appropriated to him for the present year half of the sum hitherto voted.

The Rev. Freeman Parker, of Dresden, has been authorized to continue his labours in behalf of the society for two months in Dresden and its vicinity, or in Camden, in both which places the destitute and divided state of the societies had required aid. The following is an extract of a letter just received from Mr. Parker, from which the society may infer the fidelity and acceptance with which this mission has been fulfilled.

'In pursuance of my appointment as your Missionary, I spent the whole of the months of July and August in Dresden. During that term I preached twenty sermons, and in addition to the stated services on the Lord's day, had a third meeting for social prayer, reading, &c., and attended two church prayer meetings. I made as many family visits as I was able, visited the sick and the summer schools, twice administered the Lord's Supper, and in general, performed the usual routine of parochial duty. The last spring the Congregational society organized as the first parish, and voted one hundred and fifty dollars towards my support for the present year—the *first regular tax* for the support of the Gospel, which has been voted and assessed since the dissolution of my connexion with the town in 1816. Several families of influence withdrew from the Methodist society, and annexed themselves to the first parish. In consequence of these exertions and the earnest desire of the church and parish, I thought it my duty to give them the whole time assigned me by the society.'

In consideration of the representations frequently given of the destitute and decaying state of many societies in the Common-



wealth, from the want of seasonable aid and encouragement, no less than from the immediate inroads of sectarianism, and from the fact, that a spirit of inquiry was rapidly advancing, more especially in the western part of the Commonwealth, it was deemed expedient by the Trustees to employ a Missionary at large for the purpose of obtaining information as to the spiritual necessities and prospects of such societies within the Commonwealth; and the Rev. Dan Huntington was accordingly authorized to commence a missionary tour of one month, in such portion of the state as might seem most expedient. It was thought that a correspondence might be opened with influential men in such towns, and that an interest might be awakened or increased in the leading objects of the society. The Trustees have the satisfaction to state, that their views in this mission have been fully answered.

From information communicated relative to the condition of the society in Shirley, the Trustees have aided the efforts of the people in that place for the re-settlement and support of the ministry; and they are happy to learn that the prospects in that place are encouraging, and that with the aids afforded from our funds, the people are now enjoying the benefits of regular preaching; and it is hoped may soon be united under a pious and useful ministry.

The Trustees have received an urgent application from a committee of the first Congregational society in New Bedford, which was formerly under the care of Rev. Dr. West; and at their request Mr. Wiswall and Mr. Tracy have in succession been labouring among them. This society has, for some time past, been in a doubtful and feeble state; but they express great satisfaction in the assistance they have received, and earnestly request that it may be continued. In this and in every other instance in which appropriations have been made, or assistance rendered by the Trustees, it has been invariably on the supposition and express condition of the co-operation of the people. One half of the compensation has usually been contributed by the societies to whom missionaries have been sent. And the assistance granted has frequently called forth efforts, which might of themselves have been ineffectual, or have never been attempted.

The Trustees in this Report have thought it necessary to exhibit only a simple statement of their proceedings during the past year. The design and modes of operation of the society they presume to be understood; and the particulars of the situation and needs of those places, to which their attention has been chiefly directed, have been, as well as the grounds on which

the Trustees have proportioned their aids, fully exhibited in preceding reports. The experience of more than fifteen years may have abundantly convinced the friends of the society of the sound judgment as well as benevolence with which the plan was originally formed, and of the encouraging success which has attended its progress. They believe, that with the blessing of heaven, which they would gratefully acknowledge, much good has already been accomplished. In some instances, destitute and decaying churches have been revived and established; and many, who, from long habit, had become indifferent and careless, have been led to a grateful and diligent attendance on the means of religion. In others, new societies have been formed, and the Gospel preached, where, in its public instructions at least, it had not been heard. We have already been permitted to see some fruits of our endeavours in the increasing knowledge, harmony, and seriousness of many to whom we have sent; and we may humbly hope, that still more abundant fruit may hereafter appear, 'which shall be by Jesus Christ to the praise and glory of God.'—At the same time, and notwithstanding the increasing interest which has been excited towards us, we must lament the inadequacy of our resources. Many applications are made, which we are unable to answer; and it will sufficiently appear from this statement, that in many instances, in which the urgency of the call would not permit us to withhold our assistance, it has of necessity been very limited. We solicit, therefore, the aid of the pious and the charitable. We believe that the objects of this society, and the mode in which it proposes to accomplish them, will approve themselves to an enlightened benevolence; and we trust that the friends of rational and practical christianity, while they are slow to contribute to what may seem a distant or uncertain good, will not incur the reproach of indifference or forgetfulness to the spiritual wants and interests of their brethren at home.

\* \* The list of donations for the last six months will be given in the next number.

---

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G., and H. O. N., and a communication without signature, have been received. As the next number will complete the present volume, it is requested that all articles designed for publication, may be given in at latest, by the 10th day of December.